

Lawrence Cotter, North Brookfield.  
Josephine E. Dempsey, South Ashburnham.  
Anna Wohlrab, South Sudbury.  
James H. Anderson, Ware.

## MICHIGAN

Helen M. Kane, Algonac.  
George P. Siagkris, Base Line.  
Carl V. Moody, Copemish.  
Vedah W. Halterman, De Witt.  
Fred W. Schroeder, East Detroit.  
Joseph F. Roberts, Elkton.  
Norman C. Lee, Farmington.  
James L. Heslop, Gladwin.  
Leo G. Burns, Kingston.  
Clarence J. Maloney, Mass.  
Edwin Boyle, Milford.  
Frank C. Miller, Stevensville.

## MISSOURI

Ethel Rose, Bogard.  
Howard L. Stephens, Eldon.  
Frank M. Story, Kahoka.  
William G. Warner, Lamar.  
Harvey F. Nalle, Pattonsburg.  
Oliver A. Cook, Portageville.

## MONTANA

Shebel Rehal, Chester.

## NEVADA

Dora E. Kappler, Carlin.  
Mabel L. Andrews, Hawthorne.  
Linwood W. Campbell, Pioche.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Roland A. Lewin, Hanover.  
Arthur L. Prince, Manchester.

## NEW YORK

Moses Symington, Long Island City.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Wade C. Hill, Canton.  
Fletcher C. Mann, Pittsboro.

## OHIO

Ray W. Senn, Attica.  
Elmer E. Eller, Cuyahoga Falls.

## OKLAHOMA

John K. Jones, Blair.  
Thomas A. Gray, Duncan.  
Laura A. Plunkett, Gould.  
Mona Clark, Idabel.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Rufus R. McLeod, Hartsville.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Adolph M. Kaufmann, Colman.

## VIRGINIA

Jay C. Litts, Norton.

## WASHINGTON

Fred E. Booth, Castle Rock.  
Clyde F. Shrauger, Mount Vernon.  
Dorothy H. Lynch, Soap Lake.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Henry S. Lambert, Kenova.

## WISCONSIN

Joseph Schmidtkofer, Chilton.  
George E. Shaw, Cornell.  
Herman W. Paff, Elk Mound.  
Ira A. Kenyon, Mellen.  
John P. Snyder, Oconomowoc.  
Herman H. Lins, Spring Green.  
Robert L. Graves, Viroqua.  
Christian R. Mau, West Salem.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 3, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon,  
Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, Thou who wert the God of our fathers, we rejoice that Thou art also the God of their succeeding generations. Hitherto Thou hast blessed us. Thy mercies are without number and the treasury of Thy goodness is infinite.

We pray that we may show forth our gratitude in lives of devotion. Fill our minds and hearts with those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy. May we have such a love for Thy truth that we shall come to know the truth of Thy love.

Bless our President and all who are in positions of leadership and service in the life of our Republic. Give them wisdom to know and strength to perform the duties of their high calling.

May we be a Nation whose God is the Lord. Keep us in the vanguard of the upward march toward the final triumph of peace and righteousness.

In the name of the Prince of Peace, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 31, 1939:

H. R. 153. An act to transfer jurisdiction over commercial prints and labels, for the purpose of copyright registration, to the Register of Copyrights;

H. R. 542. An act for the relief of Anna Elizabeth Watrous;

H. R. 1982. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to classify officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 2234. An act for the relief of W. E. R. Covell;

H. R. 3623. An act for the relief of Capt. Clyde E. Steele, United States Army;

H. R. 3673. An act for the relief of the Allegheny Forging Co.;

H. R. 3730. An act for the relief of John G. Wynn;

H. R. 3834. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate steam and other operating engineering in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1887, as amended;

H. R. 4440. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Shebestok, parents of Constance and Lois Shebestok;

H. R. 5660. An act to include Lafayette Park within the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital," approved May 16, 1930; and

H. R. 6503. An act relating to the exchange of certain lands in the State of Oregon.

On August 1, 1939:

H. R. 4647. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; and

H. R. 6076. An act to provide for the registry of pursers and surgeons as staff officers on vessels of the United States, and for other purposes.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4085. An act for the relief of certain disbursing agents and employees of the Indian Service;

H. R. 6664. An act to admit the American-owned barges *Prari* and *Palpa* to American registry and to permit their use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 7089. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to Howard Hughes in recognition of his achievements in advancing the science of aviation;

H. R. 7090. An act to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 481);

H. R. 7091. An act to amend section 4471 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 464);

H. J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to establish the Major General William Jenkins Worth Memorial Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to the memory of Maj. Gen. William Jenkins Worth; and

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution establishing a commission to be known as the Virginia (Merrimac)-Monitor Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2868. An act to facilitate the procurement of aircraft for the national defense; and

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to authorize compacts or agreements between or among the States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean with respect to fishing in the territorial waters and the bays and inlets of the Atlantic Ocean on which such States border, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6475. An act to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6505. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. R. 6556. An act to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used to transport narcotic drugs, firearms, and counterfeit coins, obligations, securities, and paraphernalia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 6. An act to return a portion of the Grand Canyon National Monument to the public domain;

S. 474. An act to amend section 92 of the Judicial Code to provide for a term of court at Kalispell, Mont.;

S. 809. An act for the relief of Jessie M. Durst;

S. 891. An act for the relief of J. C. Grice;

S. 1092. An act for the relief of Sigvard C. Foro;

S. 1394. An act for the relief of Johannes or John, Julia, Michael, William, and Anna Kostiuk;

S. 1429. An act for the relief of Earl J. Reed and Giles J. Gentry;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Montie S. Carlisle;

S. 1821. An act for the relief of Harry K. Snyder;

S. 1905. An act for the relief of Elizabeth E. Burke; and

S. 2408. An act for the relief of Russell B. Hendrix.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1708) entitled "An act to amend the Employers' Liability Act," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. NEELY, Mr. BURKE, and Mr. AUSTIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 839) entitled "An act to amend the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904."

#### INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN SEEDS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5625) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in seeds; to require labeling and to prevent misrepresentation of seeds in interstate commerce; to require certain standards with respect to certain imported seeds; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 16, lines 8 and 9, strike out "or vegetable."

Page 16, lines 9 and 10, strike out "such records as may be prescribed by rules and regulations prescribed under section 402 of this act" and insert "for a period of 3 years a complete record of origin, germination, and purity of each lot of agricultural seed offered."

Page 16, line 24, after "him", insert "And provided further, That such seeds produced or sold by him when transported or offered for transportation to any State, Territory, or District, shall not be exempted from the provisions of sections 201 and 202 unless said seeds shall be in compliance with the operation and effect of the laws of such State, Territory, or District, enacted in the exercise of its police power, to the same extent and in the same manner as though such seed had been produced, sold, offered, or exposed for sale in such State, Territory, or District, and shall not be exempted therefrom by reason of being introduced therein in original packages or otherwise."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PRELIMINARY EXAMINATIONS AND SURVEYS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6634) amending previous Flood Control Acts, and authorizing certain preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 15, insert:

"Sec. 3a. Buffalo Bayou and its tributaries, Texas; the project set forth in House Document No. 456, Seventy-fifth Congress, and authorized by Public Law No. 685, Seventy-fifth Congress, is hereby modified in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of Public Law No. 761, Seventy-fifth Congress, and all requirements of local cooperation inconsistent with said section 2 are hereby eliminated."

Page 3, line 13, after "District:", insert "Provided further, That the Secretary of War is authorized to pay to said district forthwith on the passage of this act, the sum of \$1,500,000, on verification of the fact that reimbursable expenditures in such amount have been made by the district, and on the agreement of the district, duly certified to the Secretary of War, that it will proceed immediately to convey and transfer any assets acquired through such expenditures not already conveyed, but such payment may be made prior to the actual transfer of title to lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other property."

Page 3, after line 16, insert:

"Sec. 5. Section 2 of Public Law No. 761, Seventy-fifth Congress, is hereby amended by adding the following: 'Provided further, That in all cases of the acquisition hereunder by the United States from the Los Angeles County Flood Control District or the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District of lands, easements, or rights-of-way, wherein the written opinion of the Attorney General in favor of the validity of the title to such lands, easements, or rights-of-way is or may be required or authorized by law, the Attorney General may, in his discretion, base such opinion upon a certificate of title of the district from which said lands, easements, or rights-of-way are to be acquired accompanied by an agreement, duly executed by the district in conformity with the constitutions and laws of the State where the district in question is situated to indemnify the United States against all claims, liabilities, loss, expenses, and attorneys' fees of whatsoever kind or nature, resulting from or arising out of any defect or defects whatsoever in the title to any such lands, easements, or rights-of-way so conveyed to the United States, including all just compensation, costs, and expenses which may be incurred in any condemnation proceeding deemed necessary and instituted by the United States in order to perfect title to any such lands, easements, or rights-of-way.'"

Page 3, line 17, strike out "5" and insert "6."

Page 4, line 9, after "Congress:" insert "Provided, That the power and authority conferred by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and previously conferred, upon the Federal Power Commission shall remain in full force and effect."



Page 4, after line 23, insert:  
 "Green River, Mass."  
 Page 5, after line 4, insert:  
 "Mohawk River, N. Y."  
 Page 5, after line 15, insert:  
 "Purdy Reservoir on Rush Creek, Okla."  
 Page 5, after line 15, insert:  
 "Dirty Creek, Muskogee County, Okla."  
 Page 5, after line 15, insert:  
 "Mangum-Slat Fork, Greer County, Okla."  
 Page 5, after line 15, insert:  
 "Fairfax-Kaw City, Osage County, Okla."  
 Page 5, after line 16, insert:  
 "Hobolochito River, Miss."  
 Page 5, after line 16, insert:  
 "Hatchie River and tributaries, Mississippi and Tennessee."  
 Page 5, after line 19, insert:  
 "Whiteoak and Straight Creeks, Ohio."  
 Page 5, after line 21, insert:  
 "Kentucky River and its tributaries, Kentucky."  
 Page 6, after line 6, insert:  
 "South Platte River and its tributaries, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska."  
 Page 6, after line 6, insert:  
 "Neskowin Creek, Oreg."  
 Page 6, after line 7, insert:  
 "Skykomish River, Wash."  
 Page 6, after line 18, insert:  
 "Sec. 7. That the Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River, N. Mex., is hereby authorized and declared to be for the purposes of controlling floods, regulating the flow of the Pecos River, providing for storage and for delivery of stored waters, for the reclamation of lands, and other beneficial uses, and said dam and reservoir shall be used, first, for irrigation; second, for flood control and river regulation; and third, for other purposes. The Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War are directed to report to the Congress the amount of the total cost of said Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir which is properly allocable to flood control. The appropriation and transfer of such amount from the general fund of the Treasury to the reclamation fund, for credit by reduction of the maximum obligation of the Carlsbad irrigation district to repay the total cost thereof, is hereby authorized."  
 Page 6, after line 18, insert:  
 "Sec. 8. In the case of any local flood-protection work in the Ohio River Basin authorized to be prosecuted by the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled 'An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes,' approved June 28, 1938, the President is authorized to waive the requirements of section 3 of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, with respect to local cooperation to the extent of not to exceed 50 percent of the estimated cost of the lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for such work, if he finds, after investigation, that the city or town to be benefited by such work is, by reason of its financial condition, unable to comply with the requirements of such section 3 with respect to local cooperation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Mississippi explain what these amendments do?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, before submitting the request, which is agreeable to the members of the Committee on Flood Control, I called a meeting of that committee, which considered the amendments adopted by the Senate. The members of the Flood Control Committee were substantially in agreement as to all of the amendments with the exception of one or two. The one amendment I refer to is the so-called Minton amendment, which provided that in the case of local flood-control projects in the Ohio Basin the President of the United States might, in his discretion, after he had investigated the matter and if he were satisfied that any town or city was not able to comply with the local contribution, reduce not to exceed 50 percent that local contribution. I may say a similar provision in the exact language of the Minton amendment appears in the act of August 28, 1937, in which act Congress authorized the expenditure of \$24,877,000 for flood control in the Ohio Basin. In the exercise of that discretion the President of the United States followed the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and it was only exercised in three cases, one at Paducah, Ky., and the amount that the President waived in that case was \$160,000. In the second case it was exercised at Rockport, Ill., and the amount waived was \$4,500. It was waived in a third case at Golconda, Ill., and the amount waived was \$24,860.

In the act of June 28, 1938, we authorized additional local projects in the Ohio River Valley aggregating \$50,300,000.

In answer to the gentleman's inquiry, I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the only case where the President would likely be called upon to exercise this discretion would be at Jeffersonville, Ind., where the United States Government has a large War Department depot, in which as I am advised millions of dollars of war supplies are stored.

That property is not to be available for local taxation and would not be subject to taxation in order to provide the local contribution. In my judgment, if the President reduced the local contribution there, it would not be in excess of a few hundred thousand dollars at the outside. Moreover, it is my view and the view of the committee, that at the next session of Congress there should be a uniform yardstick adopted and this provision should be made applicable to all basins and to all projects, or else repealed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It should be one or the other. There is no question about that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree with the gentleman. Before I called up this bill I submitted the request to and asked the Chief of Engineers to give me a report on each of the Senate amendments. I hold in my hand a letter from the Chief of Engineers which I expect to incorporate in my remarks as extended, in which he states the amendments are agreeable to him and he has no objection to any of them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These amendments have the uniform support of the gentleman's committee on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Except as I have stated.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the President has not yielded in any case unless there was some special reason?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct, and I have given not only the three cases but the amounts. The amount he yielded on in connection with these projects that cost some \$25,000,000 amounted to about \$189,000.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman that I live in the Ohio Valley, as the gentleman knows. At this time there are a great many projects going on there and we have to pay the full amount in every case. So the idea should not go out that the Ohio Valley is getting anything. In the case of my own town we have paid every penny and this is true in the case of every place within a hundred miles. In this one town referred to, the Government has a great institution of its own and the people think the Government ought to contribute something.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, if there are any inequalities in the law with reference to other projects, the committee will at the next session of Congress endeavor to correct such situations?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

In extending my remarks at this point, under leave granted, I repeat the Committee on Flood Control is agreeable to the Senate amendments with one or two exceptions. The principal exception was in respect to the so-called Minton amendment, as I have stated. However, under a similar amendment in the act of 1937 the President did not waive any local contribution by 50 percent. The Committee on Flood Control in 1937, and again in 1938 and 1939, heard witnesses in advocacy of the policy of the Minton amendment. It applied, as I have stated, to authorizations in the act of August 28, 1937, amounting to \$24,877,000, but the discretion was only exercised by the President in three cases and in no case did he reduce the local contribution by 50 percent. In the case of Paducah, Ky., a city of some 40,000 people—that was completely overflowed in 1937—the President waived 40 percent of the local contribution required by law and the amount waived was \$160,000. At Golconda the amount waived was 45.5 percent and the amount was \$24,860. At Brookport he waived 32.6 percent and the amount was \$4,500. The Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, authorized \$50,300,000 for additional local

protective works in the Ohio Basin and the Minton amendment would be applicable to this increased authorization just as an identical provision was applicable to the prior authorization of \$24,877,000. The provision in 1937 was also inserted in the Senate. The Committee on Flood Control in the House has taken the view that a definite yardstick should be applied to all projects along all rivers. The committee intends to report a flood-control bill at the next session of Congress and it plans either to make the Minton amendment applicable to all local protective projects in all parts of the country or to repeal the same. It is also fair to say that the President has not waived the local contribution unless the waiver is recommended by the Chief of Engineers. There is only one case as I have stated where there will likely be a waiver and that is at Jeffersonville, Ind., where the United States Government has an Army depot and stores millions of dollars of Army equipment. The United States property is not subject to taxation to provide the local contribution and is one of the principal properties benefited by the flood-control project. It is not believed that the waiver at Jeffersonville will materially exceed the waiver that was made at Paducah.

The amendment in section 3a places the Buffalo Bayou, Tex., flood-control project for the protection of the city of Houston on an equality with flood-control projects approved in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938.

With deference, I desire to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors adopted this project in the rivers and harbors bill in the Seventy-fifth Congress, Public Document 685. It should have been considered by the House Committee on Flood Control. The acceptance of the amendment putting this project on an equality with other flood-control projects must not be construed as a precedent. Flood-control projects should not be included in river and harbor bills and navigation projects should not be included in flood-control bills, except as navigation is incidental to flood control.

The Senate amendment with respect to the Muskingum project does not change the authorization and is recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

The Senate inserted a new section 5 with respect to the approval of titles in the Muskingum project and in the Los Angeles project. The amendment was recommended by the Attorney General and approved by the Bureau of the Budget. At the time the bill was passed by the House no report had been received on a bill covering the subject matter that was pending before the Committee on Flood Control. The Flood Control Committee only reported items that were recommended by the Chief of Engineers on which favorable reports had been submitted.

The Senate inserted section 7 with respect to the Alamo-gordo Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River. This project has been constructed. It is for multiple purposes. It is stated that there are flood-control benefits. The amendment authorizes the Chief of Engineers to report to Congress the amount allocable to flood control and authorizes the deduction of such amount in the assessment to be collected from property owners.

The Senate inserted a perfecting amendment to section 5 of the bill as it passed the House, which is section 6 as passed by the Senate, to the effect that the power and authority conferred in the Flood Control Act of June 23, 1928, and previously conferred upon the Federal Power Commission shall remain in full force and effect. This amendment in nowise changes the meaning of the section with respect to preliminary examinations and surveys. The language in the bill as it passed the House is substantially the identical language to give effect to the intent of Congress in exempting the Corps of Engineers from reorganization. As shown by colloquies on the floor of the House and Senate at the time the reorganization bill was under consideration, and particularly in the colloquy between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] and myself, the exemption of the Corps of Engineers from reorganization carried with the exemption the exemp-

tion of the functions of the Engineer Corps and its head. It was definitely understood and intended by Congress that flood-control and river and harbor works should remain the function of the Engineer Corps, United States Army, and its head, the Chief of Engineers, to be administered under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers.

Certain powers were conferred upon the Federal Power Commission in the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938. Section 5 as it passed the House expressly excepted the power conferred upon the Power Commission in the act of June 28, 1938, and otherwise by other laws conferred upon the Power Commission, and I quote from the language of section 5 as it passed the House:

Except as otherwise specifically provided by Congress.

I may also add that the House Committee on Flood Control not only agreed to the Senate amendments as herein stated but before submitting the request to concur in the Senate amendments I not only followed the action of the House Committee on Flood Control, including the ranking minority members of the committee, but I conferred with the distinguished minority leader of the House. We only agreed to the Senate amendments after we were advised that they were not objectionable to the Chief of Engineers, and under leave I include the following letter from the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. J. L. Schley, to me, dated August 2, 1939, to wit:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, August 2, 1939.

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE WHITTINGTON: I have carefully considered the amendments made by the Senate in the pending flood-control bill and, in accordance with your request, I am pleased to give you my views thereon.

The first amendment added by the Senate Committee on Commerce, consists of broadening language for the Muskingum project which will enable this Department to make immediate payment of funds already appropriated pursuant to authority contained in the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938. A further amendment would authorize the Attorney General to accept title to lands, easements, and rights-of-way upon a certificate of title from the district concerned and as guaranteed by it. This amendment has the approval of the Attorney General. The final amendment authorized the Department to make a study of the Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River, N. Mex., to determine how much of the cost of that reservoir is chargeable to flood control, it being understood that no appropriation of flood-control funds is contemplated. In addition, there were added on the floor of the Senate, amendments which are discussed as follows:

One to place the Buffalo Bayou, Tex., project, previously authorized by Public, No. 685, Seventy-fifth Congress, under the conditions of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938. A further amendment safeguarding the interests of the Federal Power Commission, in accordance with authorities previously conferred. After careful consideration, upon your specific request, I can see no reason why the amendments above outlined are objectionable.

There have also been added several authorities to make preliminary examinations and surveys. The examinations and surveys have been considered in each instance and are found desirable.

The final amendment proposed on the floor of the Senate would operate to authorize the President to waive up to 50 percent of the estimated cost of lands, easements, and rights-of-way for cities or towns in the Ohio River Basin found to be financially unable to bear the full cost. This amendment opens a question of policy for determination by the Congress. However, I don't feel justified in interposing any objection to the extension to the communities in the Ohio River Basin of a similar policy authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 26, 1937.

Very truly yours,

J. L. SCHLEY, Major General,  
Chief of Engineers.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to, and the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I just made and to include the letter referred to from the Chief of Engineers dated August 2, 1939.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?  
There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks with reference to the bill H. R. 6618, and include therein a brief statement and analysis of the bill by Mr. C. P. Carter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?  
There was no objection.

## EQUALIZATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2001) for the equalization of letter carriers, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. ROMJUE, Mr. BURCH, Mr. WHELCHER, Mr. BLACKNEY, and Mr. AUSTIN.

## MUSKINGUM RIVER CANAL, BEVERLY, OHIO

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed a number of House bills relating to the construction of bridges and has made but minor amendments to them. I am going to ask unanimous consent to take these bills from the Speaker's desk and concur in the Senate amendments in each case.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3375) to authorize M. H. Gildow to construct a free, movable, pontoon footbridge across Muskingum River Canal at or near Beverly, Ohio, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 3, after "Gildow", insert ", his heirs or legal representatives."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, CASSVILLE, WIS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6049) authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 4, strike out "reasonable."

Page 3, line 4, after "interest", insert "at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum."

Page 3, line 4, after "and", where it appears the second time, insert "reasonable."

Page 3, line 5, after "cost", insert "as approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE CONNECTICUT RIVER, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6353) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Hartford, Conn., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike out "reasonable."

Page 2, line 9, after "interest", insert "at a rate of not to exceed 5 percent per annum."

Page 2, line 9, after "and", insert "reasonable."

Page 2, line 9, after "cost", insert "as approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. LOUIS RIVER BETWEEN THE STATES OF MINNESOTA AND WISCONSIN

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6475) to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "a point in."

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "as approved, within a reasonable time, by the City Council of the City of Superior, Wis., and."

Page 5, line 11, after "owned", insert "by the city of Duluth, and shall be."

Page 5, line 12, after "Duluth", insert "and the city of Superior."

Page 5, after line 20, insert:

"Sec. 5. The city of Superior, Douglas County, State of Wisconsin, shall share equally with said city of Duluth in the consideration and determination of all questions with respect to the exercise by the city of Duluth of all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred upon the city of Duluth by the provisions of this act, and none of the rights, powers, and privileges herein conferred shall be exercised by said city of Duluth without the consent and approval of the city of Superior as expressed by resolution of the city council of said city of Superior."

Page 5, line 21, strike out "5" and insert "6."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN DELTA POINT, LA., AND VICKSBURG, MISS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3224) creating the Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Delta Point, La., and Vicksburg, Miss., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out all after "act", down to and including "act", in line 9, and insert "Whenever, and for the time only, that said bridge is not in operative condition by reason of accident, damage, repair, or other causes beyond the control of said Commission, said Commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to maintain and operate a ferry, or ferries, across the Mississippi River at or within 15 miles of said bridge, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act: *Provided*, That the acquisition and operation of a ferry or ferries shall only be in the event that the condition of said bridge is such that it cannot be used and as soon as repaired or again usable no ferry or ferries shall be operated: *Provided further*, That no permission shall be given for the operation of a ferry or ferries within 15 miles of said bridge without the direct repeal of this section of the act."

Page 9, line 18, strike out all after "to", down to and including "provide" in line 21 and insert "railroad or railroads using bridge."

Page 10, line 5, after "property", insert "only insofar as it is essential and necessary in the operation of the bridge."

Page 10, line 10, strike out all after "persons", down to and including "Mississippi" in line 12 and insert "one of whom shall be appointed by the Governor of Louisiana from the congressional district in the State of Louisiana wherein is located the west approach to said bridge, one of whom shall be appointed by the Governor of Mississippi from the congressional district in the State

of Mississippi wherein is located the east approach to said bridge, and one of whom shall be appointed by the Commissioner of Public Roads."

Page 10, lines 15 and 16, strike out "Secretary of Agriculture" and insert "Commissioner of Public Roads."

Page 10, line 23, after "appointed", insert "and/or by the Commissioner of Public Roads as herein provided."

Page 11, line 1, strike out "Department of Agriculture" and insert "Federal Works Agency."

Page 11, line 14, strike out "\$500" and insert "\$1,200."

Page 13, after line 21, insert:

"Sec. 13. The cost of acquisition of said bridge by said Commission shall not include goodwill, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of construction, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value; (2) the actual cost of acquiring interests in the necessary real property; (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 2 percent of the cost of construction of such a bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interests in the necessary real property; and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements."

Page 13, line 22, strike out "13" and insert "14."

Page 14, line 1, strike out "14" and insert "15."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LOCAL DELIVERY RATE ON CERTAIN FIRST-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2893) to provide for the local delivery rate on certain first-class mail matter. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if this bill increases the distance over the regular zones that are now in existence in the Postal Service?

Mr. ROMJUE. No; this bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. RICH. Does this bill have the approval of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads?

Mr. ROMJUE. It has.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the proviso in section 1001 of the Revenue Act of 1932 (relating to postal rates) is amended to read as follows: "Provided, That such additional rate shall not apply to first-class matter mailed for local delivery or for delivery wholly within a county the population of which exceeds 1,000,000, provided said county is entirely within a corporate city."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 153]

Barnes	Dingell	Kennedy, Martin	Reed, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Ditter	Kunkel	Rockefeller
Boren	Douglas	Lanham	Ryan
Byron	Eaton, Calif.	Lesinski	Schaefer, Ill.
Caldwell	Eaton, N. J.	Ludlow	Schwert
Chapman	Fernandez	McGranery	Secrest
Ciuett	Fish	McMillan, Thos. S.	Short
Coffee, Nebr.	Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Stearns, N. H.
Collins	Folger	Massingale	Stefan
Cooley	Ford, Leland M.	Mitchell	Summers, Tex.
Creal	Ford, Thomas F.	O'Neal	Sweeney
Crowe	Green	Patman	Thill
Crowther	Harrington	Powers	White, Idaho
Cummings	Holmes	Rabaut	Woodruff, Mich.
Curley	Hook	Rankin	
Dies	Johnson, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### ASSISTANT TO THE SURGEON GENERAL

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1899) to provide for the detail of a commissioned medical officer of the Public Health Service to serve as assistant to the Surgeon General.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are you putting on another assistant to the Surgeon General?

Mr. BULWINKLE. To the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Mr. RICH. Is this putting on a new assistant?

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is just giving the man the rank provided in the measure. This is the unanimous report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the detail of a commissioned medical officer of the Public Health Service to serve as assistant to the Surgeon General and be Acting Surgeon General in the absence of the Surgeon General. The bill was strongly recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. It was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Finance and passed in the Senate by unanimous consent.

The expansion of the work of the Public Health Service has imposed administrative responsibilities upon the Surgeon General which are more than he alone can meet. In recent years two additional administrative divisions have been added to the Bureau, namely, the Division of Mental Hygiene and the Division of Venereal Diseases, and many new functions have been imposed upon the Service by statute. There is a distinct need that statutory provision be made for the detail of an experienced administrative officer to assist the Surgeon General in his work.

As a temporary expedient, the Surgeon General has removed from one of the administrative divisions the Assistant Surgeon General most experienced in the administrative work of the Service and has assigned to him a share of the responsibility and work devolving upon the office of the Surgeon General. However, this officer is unable to assume the duties and responsibilities of the Surgeon General in his absence because of the provision contained in the act of July 1, 1902, that the Assistant Surgeon General, senior in total Public Health Service, shall assume the duties of the Surgeon General in his absence. Consequently the duties of the Surgeon General in such an instance devolve upon a division chief who is relatively unfamiliar with them and who is fully occupied with duties of his own.

The proposed legislation will remedy this situation by enabling the Surgeon General to detail to the position of assistant to the Surgeon General established by the bill a commissioned medical officer possessed of the experience and qualifications to enable him to aid the Surgeon General in his work and who, in the absence of the Surgeon General, can assume the duties and responsibilities of that officer. The bill will permit a new Surgeon General to select an administrative assistant of his own choosing and will allow conformance with the practice of the Public Health Service of detailing commissioned medical officers for service in Washington for periods of not longer than 8 years.

The total increase in cost as a result of this legislation will not exceed \$300 per annum. The maximum salary and allowances of the new position will be \$7,500 per year, which is only \$300 in excess of that of the existing grades of Assistant Surgeon General and Medical Director from which the officer detailed to the new position will be selected. The bill does not increase the number of commissioned officers in the Public Health Service and the position vacated by the officer detailed to serve as assistant to the Surgeon General will remain open while he is thus serving.



The increase in salary will be only \$300 over that of the existing grades of Assistant Surgeon General and medical director. The maximum salary and allowances of these grades is \$7,200. The maximum salary and allowances of the new position will be \$7,500. It is contemplated that the officer selected for this position will be from a \$7,200 grade.

The bill does not increase the number of commissioned officers in the Public Health Service. Congress places a numerical limitation on the number of commissioned officers in the annual appropriation act. No increase in the number of commissioned officers will be requested on account of S. 1899.

The officer who will serve as Assistant to the Surgeon General under the provisions of S. 1899 will be selected by the Surgeon General from the regular commissioned corps on the basis of experience and general fitness for the position. The position which he vacates to become Assistant to the Surgeon General will remain open while he is thus serving, and upon the expiration of his term of appointment as Assistant to the Surgeon General he will return to the same position which he would have occupied had he not been so appointed. This system is applicable to an officer who is appointed by the President to serve for a time as Surgeon General and to officers who are appointed by the Surgeon General to serve at his pleasure as chiefs of the administrative divisions and designated as Assistant Surgeons General while so serving. These provisions are by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury after approval by the President. The positions of Surgeon General and Assistant Surgeon General are established by act of Congress. Similarly, the proposed position of Assistant to the Surgeon General would be established by S. 1899.

Numerical replacements of officers in any grade and any length of service who may die or otherwise vacate their positions can be made only by employing new officers entering at the foot of the lowest and entering grade. This is specified by the act of April 9, 1930, which provides that the conditions of promotion, pay, and allowances of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service shall be the same as for commissioned officers of the Medical Corps of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill (S. 1899), as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That there shall be in the Public Health Service a commissioned medical officer of the Public Health Service, detailed by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, who shall be known as the Assistant to the Surgeon General, and who shall perform such duties as the Surgeon General may prescribe and shall act as Surgeon General during the absence or disability of the Surgeon General or in the event that there is a vacancy in the office of the Surgeon General. The Assistant to the Surgeon General, while serving as such Assistant, shall have a rank in the Public Health Service which shall correspond to that held by a brigadier general in the United States Army, and shall be entitled to the same pay and allowances as a brigadier general in the Army.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL ADVISORY HEALTH COUNCIL MEMBERS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1540) to adjust the compensation of the members of the National Advisory Health Council not in the regular employment of the Government, with a committee amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from North Carolina explain what this is.

Mr. BULWINKLE. This bill is to provide that the National Advisory Health Council, which was established in 1900, be allowed \$25 per day. This will entail an additional expense of \$540 to the Government. These doctors come

from various parts of the United States and this measure puts them in line with the others.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize an increase in the compensation of those members of the National Advisory Health Council not in the regular employment of the Government. The National Advisory Health Council is an advisory board for the Public Health Service. The council consults with the Surgeon General relative to investigations to be inaugurated by the Public Health Service and the methods of conducting such investigations, and advises the Surgeon General in respect to public-health activities. It is composed of 14 members, 4 of whom are ex officio and serve without additional compensation. The 10 members not in the regular employment of the Government receive under existing law enacted over 37 years ago—section 5 of the act of July 1, 1902—compensation of \$10 per day while serving in conference, together with allowance for actual and necessary traveling and hotel expenses. Under the bill these members would, while in conference, receive, instead of \$10 per day, compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Federal Security Administrator not to exceed \$25 per day. Members of the National Advisory Cancer Council, a similar organization, receive under the provisions of the National Cancer Institute Act, approved August 5, 1937, compensation at the rate of \$25 per day during the time spent in attending meetings and for time devoted to official business. It would seem only proper that there be authority to fix the compensation of members of the National Advisory Health Council on the same basis, since no difference exists between the members of the two councils either in their reputation and scientific standing or in the quality of the service rendered.

The bill would also permit the utilization of the services of council members outside of conference but in connection with conference matters, and authorize payment for such services at the same rate of compensation that they would receive while in conference. At times problems arise in which the advice of only one or two members of the council specially conversant with the subject matter is required. This may, for example, necessitate a visit to a field station where the work is carried on or the critical review of a scientific report. It is believed that work of this kind should not be done without remuneration.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the bill with amendments which provide for the fixing of the compensation of members of the National Advisory Health Council in an amount not to exceed \$25 per day by the Federal Security Administrator rather than by the Secretary of the Treasury, as is provided in the bill as passed by the Senate. These amendments are desirable because of the transfer on July 1, 1939, of the Public Health Service from the Treasury Department to the Federal Security Administration, pursuant to reorganization plan No. 1 submitted to Congress by the President on April 25, 1939.

The total estimated annual expenditures under the bill will be \$1,650, which will represent an increase of \$990 per annum over existing expenditures in this connection. This estimate is based on the expectation of two regular meetings each year of the council totaling 3 days in all—one of 1 day and one of 2 days—which will be attended by all 10 nongovernmental members of the council, and on the use of 6 nongovernmental members of the council an average of 6 days each per year outside of conference.

It is estimated that the additional cost will be about \$990 per annum.

There are 14 members of the council. Only 10 of these are affected. The other 4 are ex officio and receive no per diem allowance.

There are two meetings each year totaling 3 days.

The present cost of 10 members at these meetings at \$10 per day is \$300.

The cost at the proposed rate of \$25 per day will be \$750.

The additional cost of this item is therefore \$450.

In addition to the foregoing it may be necessary to utilize the services of six of the members for an additional 6 days each year.

At the old rate of \$10 a day this would cost \$360.

At the new rate of \$25 a day it will cost \$900.

The additional cost of this item is therefore \$540.

The total additional cost will therefore be: Item No. 4, \$450; item No. 5, \$540, or a total of \$990.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, in line 9, after the word "the" strike out the words "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "Federal Security Administrator"; and the same amendment in line 7, page 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPLY TO PATENT OFFICE ACTIONS

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6878) to amend section 4894 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 37), with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

In line 6, after the word "days" insert "or any extensions thereof."

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, the change made by the Senate makes it more nearly certain that the Commissioner of Patents will have authority to extend the time of response by applicants to the office action if it seems fair and equitable to do so.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PAYMENT OF FINAL FEES ON ALLOWED APPLICATIONS FOR PATENTS

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6874) to repeal section 4897 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 38) and amend sections 4885 and 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 41 and 78), which simplifies the procedure in respect of paying final fees on allowed applications for patents.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments: On page 1, line 6, strike out all after the word "by", down to and including the word "by", in line 8. In line 9, after the word "That", strike out the words "upon proof satisfactory."

And in line 10, after the word "patents", strike out the balance of line 10 and all of line 11 and insert "may in his discretion receive the final fee if."

And on page 2, line 2, strike out the words "three months" and insert "six months'."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand if this is passed it only extends the time for 60 days for an applicant to make his final payment of the fee to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. SIROVICH. The old law provided that the man must pay his fee within 6 months. The bill that the House passed provided for 3 months. The Senate amendment provides that it shall remain at 6 months, and we have agreed to that.

Mr. RICH. In other words, the bill just gives him an extension of time for the payment of the fees.

Mr. SIROVICH. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RETIREMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6747) relating to the retirement of employees to whom the provisions of section 6 of the act approved June 20, 1918 (40 Stat. 608; U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 33, sec. 763), as amended, apply, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 6747, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That any officer or employee of the Lighthouse Service who, on June 30, 1939, meets the requirements (except those relating to age and period of service) of section 6 of the act approved June 20, 1918 (40 Stat. 608; U. S. C., title 33, sec. 763), as amended or supplemented, and who shall (1) reach the age of 64 years prior to July 1, 1940, or (2) be the occupant of an office or position abolished prior to July 1, 1940, may in the discretion of the head of his executive department be retired with annual compensation as provided in said section 6: *Provided, however,* That no such officer or employee shall be retired hereunder unless he shall have been in the service of the Government not less than 30 years at the time of retirement. Any officer or employee to whom this act applies who is not retired hereunder prior to reaching the age of 65 years shall, upon reaching such age, become eligible for retirement in accordance with the provisions of said section 6 of the act of June 20, 1918, and may not be retired under the provisions of this act. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect the application of said section 6 to any officer or employee of the Lighthouse Service to whom this act does not apply."

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

#### SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE OF VESSELS, ETC.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6556) to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used to transport narcotic drugs, firearms, and counterfeit coins, obligations, securities, and paraphernalia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 6556, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 4, after "that" insert "(1) in the case of a railway car or engine, the owner, or (2) in the case of any other such vessel, vehicle, or aircraft."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object for the purpose of having the gentleman explain what the amendment does.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the principal purpose of the amendment is to provide that in the case of a railroad, a railroad train cannot be forfeited by the Government unless the owner of the train knew it was carrying contraband.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And what the gentleman seeks to amend is the bill respecting the importation of marihuana and guns and the usual implements of burglars?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And the Senate amends it so that a railroad car will not be confiscated?



Mr. ROBERTSON. Unless the owner of a railroad knew the car was hauling contraband.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I suppose the reason is because that was clearly beyond the comprehension of the law, confiscating a whole railroad for such dereliction.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A railroad has never yet been forfeited, and we think this amendment is rather immaterial.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What about a ship? Suppose a purser is guilty of such a thing. Will you forfeit the whole thing?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No. Perhaps I had better read the language.

In the case of any other such vessel, vehicle, or aircraft, the owner or the master of such vessel, or the owner or conductor, driver, pilot, or other person in charge of such vehicle or aircraft was at the time of the alleged illegal act a consenting party or privy thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

#### AMENDING EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1708) to amend the Employers' Liability Act, with amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. CELLER, Mr. HEALEY, Mr. WALTER, Mr. GUYER of Kansas, and Mr. MICHENER.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD concerning cheap electricity with the city of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION APPROPRIATION

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have the following telegram from C. A. Buettel, the president of the Colorado Farm Bureau Federation:

BURLINGTON, COLO., August 3, 1939.

Congressman JOHN A. MARTIN,  
Washington, D. C.:

The error in failure to include in the deficiency bill \$119,000,000 will be the wrecking of farm prices. We urge every effort be made to correct this mistake.

C. A. BUETTEL,  
President, Colorado Farm Bureau.

I have sent the farm leader the following answer:

AUGUST 3, 1939.

Mr. C. A. BUETTEL,  
President, Colorado Farm Bureau, Burlington, Colo.:

The Commodity Credit Corporation appropriation amendment carried in Committee of the Whole on a voice vote 95 to 94. On teller vote it was defeated 116 to 110. Under the rules no defeated amendment can be voted on in the House. A motion was ready to recommit the bill with instructions to report it back carrying the appropriation. This motion was forestalled by Mr. TABER, of New York, a leader of the Republican-Democratic coalition now in control of the House, who was entitled to recognition and who offered

a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to strike out a minor surveying expenditure of \$100,000. It was a purely parliamentary move to prevent a favorable roll call vote on the appropriation. I regard the Commodity Credit Corporation appropriation as the most beneficial of all farm-aid expenditures.

JOHN A. MARTIN, M. C.

And also the following telegram from the Farmers Union and others stressing the vital necessity of the appropriation:

ST. PAUL, MINN., August 2, 1939.

HON. JOHN A. MARTIN,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We are amazed at the decision of the House Committee on Appropriations in disproving the deficiency appropriations of \$119,000,000 for Commodity Credit Corporation. This would definitely eliminate the corn-loan program and eventually destroy the wheat and rye-loan programs if the Appropriations Committee's position should be sustained by the Congress. Without the loan programs for these three commodities they would hit an all-time low price in history. The result of such a price debacle would envelop several hundred thousand more farm families into the cataclysm of bankruptcy. Attempts to balance the Budget at such a cost is in no sense a move of economy. Admittedly the present farm programs for price and income are inadequate and incomplete, but that is no justification for abandoning the present props to hold up farm prices. We hope the House of Representatives will override the decision of the Appropriations Committee.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,  
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF GRAIN COOPERATIVES  
WHEAT CONSERVATION CONFERENCE,  
M. W. THATCHER, Legislative Representative.

I regard this as the most beneficial bit of farm aid the Appropriations Committee and the House have ever considered, and it was asked for in the President's Budget. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### PURCHASE OF BEER ON CREDIT BY RETAILERS—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 467)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

#### To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5137, an act "to prohibit the purchase of beer on credit by retailers in the District of Columbia." So far as I can recollect, I know of no legislation which has ever undertaken to order that some special kind of industrial product be sold by the manufacturer solely for cash. To establish the principle that retailers must pay cash for any special article opens the door to similar legislation, not only for the District of Columbia but for the entire country, whereby the Congress could select this, that, or the other product and command that the manufacturer thereof cease selling it on credit.

I understand that this bill is urged by brewers because they have not had wholly favorable results from selling beer in the District of Columbia to retailers by the usual credit procedure. This bill would allow whisky to continue to be sold on credit. The question of unfavorable experience on the part of the brewers seems to me to be wholly a matter that lies within their own selling practices. They should continue to sell only to such retailers as they have had good experience with. That is the usual custom adopted by manufacturers throughout the Nation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 3, 1939.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and the accompanying bill be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

#### MINIMUM AGE (SEA) CONVENTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 466)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by

the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered printed:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

To fulfill the obligations of this Government under the Minimum Age (Sea) Convention (Revised), 1936, I transmit herewith for the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft bill to implement the Convention.

This bill was prepared by an interdepartmental committee after careful consideration of the questions involved. The purpose of the proposed bill is to establish minimum standards for the employment of minors on American vessels comparable to the standards heretofore adopted by the Congress for the purpose of eliminating interstate traffic in the products of child labor. These standards consist in a basic minimum age of 16 years for employment on small vessels and a minimum age of 18 years for employment on large vessels and in certain other maritime employments considered to be particularly hazardous or detrimental to the health and well-being of minors of such ages.

I heartily recommend enactment of this proposed legislation, for it will extend still further our frontiers of social progress by erecting additional safeguards against the employment of the youth of our Nation at immature ages.

Inasmuch as the Convention heretofore ratified by the Government of the United States will become effective for the United States on October 29, 1939, it is a matter of great importance that legislation be enacted at this session of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 21, 1939.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief table dealing with agricultural imports and exports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks on the housing bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a short newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an address by Mr. Lon A. Smith, chairman of the Railroad Commission of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include certain quotations from Mr. Miller, of Oregon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include therein a statement I made before the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from the China Aid Council of Los Angeles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. COFFEE of Washington, by unanimous consent, were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

THE HOUSING BILL

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of making clear the very wide support for the housing bill that exists in my section of the country.

I have in my hand telegrams from the City Council of Los Angeles; from the chief of the Division of Immigration and Housing of the State of California; from the director of the housing authority of the city of Los Angeles; from the chairman of the Committee on Social Legislation of the City of Los Angeles; from the Motion Picture Democratic Committee; from State conference of the bricklayers, stone-masons, and plasterers unions; the district council of carpenters; the plumbers' union; and from a number of other organizations and persons of similar importance, all urging the adoption of the rule and passage of this housing bill.

I also have seen a telegram from the legislative chairman of the Farmers' Union of America, expressing strong support for this legislation; and I hope earnestly that it will be passed. I know that arguments will be made against some of the financial features of the housing program. They are the same arguments that can be made against the financing by the method of bond sales of any project or construction program whatsoever. I have an amendment which I shall offer at the proper time which I am convinced will answer those arguments. It is explained on pages 10604 and 10605 of the RECORD for July 31.

I think it is important for the Members of the House to realize that a vote for or against the rule is a vote for or against the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

TRANS-ATLANTIC AIR SERVICE—CHICAGO VIA SHEDIAC

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday, August 9, the United States representatives will meet with the representatives of the Canadian Government in an international conference at Ottawa to consider the general subject of air-transportation services between the respective countries.

It would be a forward step in the development of trans-Atlantic air service if a direct air route were inaugurated between Chicago and Shediak, New Brunswick, and thence to Botwood, Newfoundland, where the Pan American Clippers take off for Ireland. I am accordingly urging our Civil Aeronautics Authority to make this proposal one of the matters for consideration at the Conference at Ottawa next Wednesday.

The only regular trans-Atlantic service now in operation is that conducted by the Pan American Airways, Inc. It has two routes. The one known as the northern route extends from New York via Shediak, New Brunswick, and Botwood, Newfoundland, to Foynes, Ireland, and London, England. The other, known as the southern route, extends from New York via the Azores and Lisbon, Portugal, to London or Marseilles, France.

At the present time mail and passengers from Chicago go something like 710 miles by air to New York City for trans-Atlantic transportation. It is, as will be readily seen by a mere glance at the map, a circuitous route. Mileage, time, and money could be saved by the inauguration of a direct route out of Chicago across Canada to Shediak, New Brunswick, and Botwood, Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, there are several possible routes out of Chicago across Canada, instead of to New York City, that could be followed:

First. From Chicago direct to Botwood, Newfoundland—1,626.5 miles.

Second. From Chicago to Shediak, New Brunswick, and thence to Botwood, Newfoundland—1,651.5 miles.



Third. From Chicago to Detroit, to Toronto, to Ottawa, to Montreal, and thence to Botwood, Newfoundland—1,661 miles.

Fourth. From Chicago to Detroit, to Toronto, to Ottawa, to Montreal, to Shediac, and thence to Botwood, Newfoundland—1,681.5 miles.

Whichever of these four routes out of Chicago is adopted, it would be shorter than the present circuitous route across the United States to New York and thence north. I might say that of the four possibilities, the route from Chicago to Detroit, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, Shediac, and Botwood seems to be the most desirable. It has unlimited potentialities in developing air transportation service for the Midwest and far West to Europe.

It is hardly necessary to point out to this House that Chicago is the "hub" of the Nation. Like spokes in a wheel, railroad lines, air lines, and bus lines, from every direction across the continent, center in the great city of Chicago. The farmers of the great wheat and corn fields ship their products to its markets. It is the market for the fruit growers, the market for the cattle of the South and western prairies, and the center of manufacturing. In the Chicago area alone there are something like 10,000 manufacturing plants of national prominence.

In short, Mr. Speaker, a direct route of trans-Atlantic air transportation service out of Chicago may be said to be a line from the very heart of the Nation. And it should also be pointed out that the weather conditions in Chicago are excellent for flying purposes. The United States Department of Agriculture summary of Chicago records shows that during 1938 there were only 10 days of dense fog. The greatest daily range of temperature at Chicago in 1938 was 39 degrees.

I do urge, in the interest of developing and improving air transportation service, in the interest of economy and time, that my colleagues cooperate with me in an effort to inaugurate this proposed direct-route service out of Chicago to Europe. I have urged the Civil Aeronautics Authority to make this a subject for consideration at the Ottawa Conference this coming Wednesday. I am communicating with the various air lines now conducting service out of Chicago. And I earnestly solicit the full cooperation of my colleagues here in the House in advancing this proposal.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to proffer two unanimous-consent requests: First, that I may be allowed to extend my remarks in the RECORD in response to a letter which I have just received from Gen. Frank T. Hines; second, to extend in the RECORD a resolution from the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the Department of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. THORKELSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McARDLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, as I will not have time on the rule. I hope we will determine whether this bill is really a slum-clearance proposition or whether it is what they sometimes call "pork." It seems to be another free gift from the Public Treasury.

I want to remind you: The Scotchman saw a sign "Free Air." He took so much that all four tires blew. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not inclined at this juncture to recognize Members for any purpose except to extend remarks.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Post of July 27.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do trust that Members will not ask to address the House at this time. I shall not object to the request of the gentleman who is on his feet, but we do have a matter that we want to bring up, and I would suggest that those gentlemen who want to speak wait until the legislative business of the day is taken care of. A great many Members are seeking recognition to call up House bills with Senate amendments, and I think the business of the session should come first. I trust, therefore, that no other Member will ask to proceed until we finish the business of the day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call to the attention of the House a situation that will prevent reapportionment after the next census is taken if not corrected before the present Congress adjourns.

Section 22 of Public Act No. 13, Seventy-first Congress, which provides for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress, must be amended during the present Congress if the provisions of the Constitution providing for a redistribution of seats in the House of Representatives every 10 years are to be carried out.

H. R. 7348, the bill I introduced recently, if adopted, will provide the necessary amendments to this act.

Having received several inquiries relative to the purposes of this bill and the effect it will have on reapportionment, I wish to outline the reasons for amending section 22 of the above-mentioned act.

In enacting a reapportionment statute in 1929, it was the intent and desire of the Seventy-first Congress that thereafter reapportionment should be automatic. The situation existing during the 20-year period between the years 1910 and 1930, during which time Congress failed to provide for reapportionment, led to the enactment of an automatic reapportionment statute. In addition to this—and probably of more importance—the Constitution provides the authority and places upon Congress the duty of effecting reapportionment every 10 years.

However, section 22 of the present Reapportionment Act, if permitted to remain unchanged, will defeat the will of Congress and the demands of the Constitution.

The present law provides that—

On the first day, or within 1 week thereafter, of the second regular session of the Seventy-first Congress and of each fifth Congress thereafter, the President shall transmit to the Congress a statement showing the whole number of persons in each State—

And so forth. "Each fifth Congress thereafter"—that is the automatic clause referred to, with the Seventy-first Congress as a basis upon which to calculate the elapse of years.

The fifth Congress after the Seventy-first is the Seventy-sixth. The second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress will convene in January 1940.

Since, therefore, the President's statement must be based on the "fifteenth and each subsequent decennial census of the population," and since the sixteenth decennial census will not commence until April 1940, 3 months after the time when the President's statement based on the sixteenth decennial census is scheduled to be transmitted to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, no reapportionment can be effected. In short, the President will not have figures upon which to base his statement until approximately 1 year after the time his statement is required to be submitted under the existing statute.

H. R. 7348 corrects this anomalous situation. This bill amends section 22 (a) to read:

Within 4 weeks after the first regular session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of each fifth Congress thereafter, the President—

And so forth, without further change in subsection (a) of section 22, with the exception of changing the decennial census from the fifteenth to the sixteenth.

There would be no need for this bill and the amendments it proposes had there been no amendment to the Constitution changing the order of congressional sessions. However, the enactment of the so-called Norris lame-duck amendment has caused a mix-up in dates and thrown congressional sessions out of order with respect to reapportionment. The originators of the present reapportionment statute, I being one, did not anticipate such an amendment to the Constitution and for that reason could not word the act to meet such a contingency.

Another question has been asked concerning H. R. 7348, as follows: "Why has subsection (b) of section 22 been amended to provide a 60-day limit within which Congress may enact a law apportioning Representatives?" Here again we have the Norris amendment changing the effect of the present reapportionment statute. Suffice it to say that before the adoption of this amendment to the Constitution, Congress convened in December of one year and adjourned on March 4 the following year. Section 22 (b) of the present statute provides:

If the Congress to which the statement required by subdivision (a) of this section is transmitted, fails to enact a law apportioning representatives among the several States, then each State shall be entitled, in the second succeeding Congress and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under this act or subsequent statute, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement based on the method used in the last preceding apportionment. It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the last House of Representatives forthwith to send to the executive of each State a certificate of the number of Representatives to which such State is entitled under this section.

Before the passage of the lame-duck amendment, the report of the Clerk would be made to the States immediately after adjournment on March 4. However, at the present time, Congress convenes in January of each year and may continue the session into August, or even later. If any Congress, under the present statute, failed to enact a law apportioning Representatives the Clerk could not transmit the required certificate to the States until adjournment, which might be very late in the year. Since the great majority of State legislatures meet during the early months of the year, it is essential that they know definitely, or at least the latest date, when the certificate of the Clerk will arrive.

Mr. Speaker or Members of the House, I want to repeat, failure to enact such a time limit in the reapportionment statute will defeat the purpose of the Constitution and the desires of the Congress which adopted the present reapportionment statute.

#### AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6480) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This bill relates to the shipment of grain from small country elevators into the larger terminal warehouses. It does not cost the Government anything.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act entitled "Agricultural Adjustment Act," approved May 12, 1933, is amended by striking out the whole of subsection (5), section 8, title I, part 2, and substituting in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) No person operating a public warehouse for the storage of any basic agricultural commodity in the current of interstate or foreign commerce shall deliver any such commodity upon which a warehouse receipt has been issued and is outstanding without prior surrender and cancellation of such warehouse receipt, except that any person operating a country public grain warehouse or warehouses may, because of lack of sufficient space to accommodate all depositors, move storage grain out of such warehouse or warehouses to another warehouse for continuous storage, under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe. A nonnegotiable warehouse receipt shall be issued by the warehouseman to whom the grain was shipped, and said receiving warehouseman shall give such guaranty and shall store such grain under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe to assure delivery to the rightful owner of such grain in the amount, and of the kind, quality, and grade called for by his receipts. Any warehouseman who intends to ship grain while his original receipt is outstanding must recite in his receipt both the name and address of his warehouse as well as that of the warehouse to which the grain may be shipped under a nonnegotiable bill of lading. Any person violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. This act shall not be construed as amending or changing in any manner the United States Warehouse Act of August 11, 1916, as amended."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 4 and 5 and insert "approved May 12, 1933, as amended, is further amended by striking out the whole of section 8f, title I, part 2, and."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "(5)" and insert "Sec. 8f."

On page 2, line 18, after the word "shipped", insert "for further storage. All grain shipped under this section must be shipped."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE HOUSING ACT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 266. The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 266

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 591, an act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SABATH. This not being a partisan matter, I do not believe the other side will want any time on the rule but will want to agree unanimously to the rule. Am I correct?

Mr. MAPES. I am afraid the gentleman's imagination is working overtime. We shall need all the time we can get.



Mr. SABATH. I think you will need all the time you can get. In view of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. I agree with the chairman of the committee that it is not a partisan matter, and I expect to yield part of my time liberally to Members on his side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for 4 hours of general debate, the committee having added 1 hour to the original 3 hours requested. The rule makes in order the consideration of the housing bill passed by the Senate, one which probably for political reasons we will not waste a great deal of time trying to prevent passing. Notwithstanding what has been stated in some of the newspapers and by gentlemen who are opposed to this humane, needed legislation, I call attention to the fact that this bill will not cost the Government any money. The \$800,000,000 provided will all be lent to States, counties, and municipalities who by special legislation have organized for the purpose of providing and constructing housing facilities for the poor people of the Nation, at the same time eliminating the slum sections, the crime-breeding sections of the communities.

This bill sets aside \$200,000,000 for rural housing. Oh, I feel that there are some Members from rural sections who may say, "We do not need any," but I know of the demand that comes from people from every section of the country who do know and who have the interest of the people at heart. Right here I have telegrams from nearly every city and State that has passed special legislation asking and urging this aid for the needy. When I say that it will not cost the Government any money I say so because 1½ percent of all the loans will remain with the Government to take care of expenditures to the tune of about \$40,000,000. In attempts to prejudice the minds of Members and the people of the country against this legislation it is being charged that it will cost \$70,000,000 per year to carry out the commitments necessary under this bill. These charges are not only untrue but are in direct opposition to the facts. The actual facts are that this measure will actually cost the Government little in comparison to the great benefits. The money authorized will be lent to the housing authorities, the security for such loans being the housing projects themselves. All the bonds now being issued for projects under way are in great demand by the banks all over the United States. The new bonds likewise will be snapped up at favorable rates for the Government.

Under this bill the Government will get the money needed for the loans at an average cost of 1½ percent and will loan it out on these developments at 3 percent, leaving the difference, 1½-percent profit, a substantial margin, which will materially reduce the \$45,000,000 authorization in this bill for maintenance and operation. Thus the figures which have been quoted by multiplying the authorization by the 60-year life of the loans are but bugaboo or hokum computations.

The passage of this bill not only will provide decent housing for approximately 2,000,000 unfortunate slum dwellers but it will provide employment for nearly 500,000 workers; it will stimulate business—in fact, all industries—and at the same time will provide an outlet for the billions of dollars now reposing in the vaults of the banks throughout the country. I cannot, therefore, understand why there should be any objection to the bill unless it be, unfortunately, for political reasons; and I again say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that they will make a great mistake if they try to defeat the consideration of this bill, which is demanded by labor organizations, commercial organizations, and farm organizations throughout the United States. They have appealed for this legislation. The Senate has acted. Will you deny consideration in the face of their requests for it?

For years there has been complaint in the House that the Rules Committee has smothered legislation and deprived the membership from voting on it. Yet only yesterday, when

you had an opportunity to vote on the farmers and wage-earners relief bill you voted down the rule providing for its consideration. Today you have another opportunity, and the question is whether you will again refuse to even consider a bill carrying such vast benefits. Will you gentlemen from the rural and farming sections of our country refuse to legislate on the \$200,000,000 authorization provided for in this bill to improve the housing conditions of the poorest of the poor farmers, the sharecroppers, the farmer tenants, and those poor in the smaller towns of your districts? If you do refuse, the responsibility will again be yours and not mine. I have done my full duty and await your action. I know that the Republicans both yesterday and today were being whipped into line, but I have a right to feel that there are independent Members on the Republican side who will not be made rubber stamps by the Republican leaders and who will support this beneficial legislation. As to you Democrats who voted yesterday against the lending bill, you will be held to account when you return to your districts. I say to them, here is another opportunity offered to vote right. Do not let vicious propaganda or personal hatred against President Roosevelt sway you from your duty to your constituents and to the country. Remember the old saying, "He who digs a pitfall or grave for another is digging it for himself."

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the House Banking and Currency Committee has carefully considered the Senate bill; it has been properly amended and safeguarding and restrictive provisions added to it, making the bill, if enacted, one that can be efficiently administered. I repeat that our duty is plain, and I know that the President and all those interested in this matter and all those who are interested in the underprivileged are in favor of this beneficial legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to detain the House longer because I have many requests from gentlemen who desire to express their views in behalf of this legislation. I therefore conclude, reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in what the gentleman from Illinois just said. If I understood him correctly, he said this program would not cost the Federal Government one cent.

Mr. SABATH. Eventually not a cent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the statement, and I challenge anyone on this floor to successfully contradict it, that this bill will cost the Federal Government a very minimum of \$2,700,000,000. This bill is a supplement to the act which we passed last year and the one passed the year before by which we authorized the United States Housing Administration to make \$800,000,000 in loans; but the significant part of it is that we at the same time authorized appropriations amounting to \$28,000,000 annually over a 60-year period of time. So under existing law, much to my amazement and much to the amazement of other members of the Banking and Currency Committee, when this matter was under consideration a few weeks ago, we found we had authorized appropriations of \$1,680,000,000 for what purpose? For the sole purpose of reimbursing the Government for the original loan of \$800,000,000.

Now, this bill is presented, by which they would raise the bond authorization of the United States Housing Authority another \$800,000,000. It has been referred to quite generally as the \$800,000,000 bill. Mr. Speaker, the minimum that this will cost the Government, let me reiterate, is \$2,700,000,000. You must add the \$28,000,000 authorized by existing law to the \$45,000,000 authorized under this bill and you get the figure \$73,000,000. You may say it is a \$73,000,000 bill. But is it? You must multiply the \$73,000,000 by 60, because, if this bill is enacted, we shall have authorized an annual expenditure in the form of annual contributions of \$73,000,000, or a total of \$4,380,000,000 without taking into consideration any interest whatever. For what purpose? For the sole purpose of paying back to the Government the \$1,600,000,000 which it will loan. [Applause.]

I leave it to the judgment of every sound-thinking individual, not only on this floor but in the United States, if it is good, sound business to raise \$4,380,000,000 for the purpose of paying back a \$1,600,000,000 loan.

No contracts are made for less than 60 years. No part of the rent which is collected in any of these projects ever finds its way back into the Federal Treasury and there is no provision of law that so provides. Not one cent of this money is returned to the Treasury. So when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] or any of the other gentleman who are going to talk on this bill, speak of these as self-liquidating projects, let them show us in the bill wherein they are self-liquidating other than that this debt is liquidated by appropriating three times as much as the original debt to do so. Of course these bonds are good; of course the banks want the bonds, because the Government of the United States annually appropriates money to retire these bonds and pay the interest on the bonds, and the bill specifically says that annual contributions shall first be used to retire this debt, not only the \$1,600,000,000 debt, but also, and this is remarkable and amazing, to make available money by which the local housing authorities, who are supposed to put up 10 percent, might retire their own bonds.

Mr. Speaker, when we complete this program we will have raised the money to have built every project contracted for and at the end of 60 years we hand these projects over to the local housing authorities without the projects having cost the local housing authorities one red cent. The purposes of this bill can be accomplished by encouraging the use of a part of the \$7,000,000,000 available capital that is now frozen in the banks. A study of this whole question should be made and I implore you to do it during the present session of Congress, instead of being placed in a ridiculous position by passing this bill. I assure the House there are brains enough in this country somewhere, and we will find them, to solve the problem without too much expense to the Federal Government. A study should be made of this problem, and we can thaw out private capital for the purpose of doing this same job, and can give relief to those within the lowest income brackets, as suggested by this bill. Why do I make that statement? Because an experimental project undertaken by Girard Lambert in New Jersey has proven it can be done with a little assistance. Read the hearings. He has already developed a project with private capital; the rents are nearly as low as those charged on U. S. H. A. projects. He has done this without the benefit of subsidies. If he had a 10-percent subsidy, such as the localities are supposed to put up in cash, work, land, and so forth, by the provisions of this bill, and if he had a further subsidy of 20 percent which the localities put up in services, tax remissions or tax exemptions, he could get the cost and maintenance down to a figure low enough so that the person within the very lowest income brackets could afford to rent his homes. He is now and could continue to pay 4 percent on his bonds.

Mr. Speaker, with \$7,000,000,000 of idle credit in the banks, it is ridiculous for us to supplement and continue to furnish Government credit without giving at least some consideration to available means of thawing out this credit and putting it to work. Bear in mind this program takes care of only 15 percent of those whom the President and Mr. Straus want to serve, but there is a limit, of course, to their ambitions.

Mr. Straus tells us, assures us, that at no period of 60 years will the program cost us in annual subsidies more than \$500,000,000, or \$30,000,000,000. Can you imagine that? Thirty billion dollars he assures us will be the peak, and over a period of 60 years it will not annually cost us more than \$500,000,000. Let us think of what we are doing here.

England tried out this plan, and England came to the conclusion that if it followed the program to its logical conclusion it would empty the British exchequer. All I want to do and what this House should do is stop this program before it empties the United States Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH and Mr. KELLER rose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

The rural section of this bill was written into the bill in the Senate 5 minutes before the final vote was taken and without any consideration having been given to it by the Senate committee. It sets up a program whereby the farmer can deed to a local housing authority, provided one is organized, one-eighth of an acre, half an acre, or an acre of land, and then the authority can build a home and rent that home to the farmer for 60 years. The farmer does not own it. [Applause.]

Mr. Straus estimates that a farm home can be built for from \$2,000 to \$3,000 on land not owned by the farmer; the Farm Security Administration is now providing homes for farmers on land owned by the farmer for \$1,100.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has made a number of statements which are rather amazing and with which I cannot agree. I recall that not long ago, when the Committee on Ways and Means unanimously reported a bill to the House, by the vote of 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans, the gentleman from Michigan took the floor and, with his usual ingenuity, raised the cry of inflation, and his Republican colleagues followed him and did not follow the 10 Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The Republicans are going to vote against this rule. A vote against this rule is a vote against the bill. There are many districts represented by Republicans which have benefited by this legislation, and I am interested in seeing how they are going to vote on this rule. The money heretofore appropriated has been allocated in a fair manner, without political considerations.

Later, when the Republicans tell their friends, "Oh, I was for the bill; I was only against the rule," I hope their friends will realize a little deception is being practiced.

Everything the gentleman from Michigan has said is pertinent in the consideration of this bill in the Committee of the Whole. If the gentleman is sincere, why not vote for consideration of the bill? I have heard the Republicans talk against gag rules, and I believe there is some foundation for such talk, but now they are willing to completely gag the consideration of this bill.

As I have only 2 minutes, let me speak briefly to my friends on the Democratic side. I am not so much concerned about what happened to the rule a few days ago as I am concerned with the Democratic Party and with what happens on this rule today. The rule of a few days ago was a matter which, from a party angle, does not mean anything politically fatal to the Democratic Party—serious but not fatal.

Mr. Speaker, may I say now to my Democratic colleagues that this coalition idea can work two ways. The gentleman from Colorado earlier spoke about the coalition of yesterday. It was a different coalition than the one the day before. Action brings reaction. I do not like such reaction. I do not like action that is not consistent with the best interests of our party. All we want is the consideration of this bill. I do not like to see schisms among the members of my own party. I do not like to see a situation where those in the country are going to vote one way and those in the cities vote another way, using the Republican Party as the tail of their kite. That is the situation. That game can be played two ways, but I do not want to see it played either way. I want my party to vote for the consideration of this bill, and then when the bill comes up for consideration let individual Members vote as their conscience dictates. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the calling up of this rule constitutes a very great blunder on the part of my friend the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Rules Committee. The gentleman has no expectation whatever



that the rule will be adopted, or if adopted, no idea that the bill could possibly pass.

Mr. SABATH. I did not say that.

Mr. COX. The rule is called up for the purpose of being defeated in order that some gentlemen may have a talking point for some time in the future. I voted to report the rule for consideration of the bill; but at the time I reserved the right to vote against its adoption in the House. To press for the adoption of the rule in the face of certain defeat is a vain and foolish thing to do. It is my belief that on the call of the roll a majority of the Rules Committee will vote against the adoption of the rule.

In my opinion, the bill is infinitely less meritorious than the lending bill that the House refused to consider several days ago. Gentlemen who were heard by the Rules Committee took the position that the whole bill is nothing less than a barefaced fraud, and the statements made in support of this allegation were most persuasive.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the rule should be voted down. The chairman of the Committee on Rules offering the rule, if really interested in housing, would do a wise thing if he should ask unanimous consent that he might withdraw the rule from the further consideration of the House. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE].

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency through many years, it may be presumed that I speak with some familiarity on this subject.

When housing was first considered and when authorization to proceed was made it was believed on the part of the committee, and following that on the part of the House, that we were to engage in a lending program. It has developed into a spending program as well, as shown to you by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. This has come about by reason of the fact that experience has already demonstrated the impossibility of providing decent housing for the lower third of society without contribution from a Government source. The structures already contracted for furnish residence at an average cost of about \$4,500. It is hoped this can be reduced on some dwellings to \$3,300. Now, \$3,300 would give the kind of living quarters normally occupied by families with \$1,320 a year income, the rent being one-tenth of the value and one-quarter of the income.

The President has called to our attention his belief that one-third of our people are ill housed. It happens that one-third of our people have incomes of less than \$1,000 a year. Therefore this program at its best furnishes living quarters for nobody in that lower one-third unless supplemented by a contribution from the Government.

You will see that you are plunging into the very middle of an activity than which there is nothing more socialistic. I use the word "socialism" with no invidious significance. It is a philosophic principle for which there is argument for as well as argument against, but here you have complete socialism in undertaking to tax the people of the country in order that one-third of them may live in homes that they would not otherwise occupy.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. LUCE. I decline to yield.

This may or may not be the wise thing for us to do, but I hold its importance is such that we ought to stop, look, and listen. No great harm will come from postponing this measure until the opening of the next Congress. In the course of that time it will be possible for gentlemen unacquainted with the facts to learn what we are doing and find out with what we are threatened by reason of our actions.

It is said, to be sure, that there should be this step in order to aid the building business. The figures for June show that building had, in that period, reached a high point, perhaps not the highest ever reached, but a building boom is on. There is no important need for the Government to go farther with this thing to encourage building. We are likely

to see the biggest building boom the country ever saw as a result of private activity and private enterprise. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we are today not alone considering this rule, but we are trying a policy of the Democratic Party that has been solemnly adopted by the legislative branch of this Government.

We have adopted a policy of slum clearance. Slums are the breeding places of crime, of disease, and of immorality, and they are not only destructive of this generation, but of the generations yet to come. The bill has for its purpose a great humanitarian object. Twenty-eight States have passed enabling legislation. No State has refused to pass such legislation where it has been submitted. Three hundred and fifty local agencies have been organized. Eight hundred million dollars of funds have been allocated. Five projects have been completed and there are now applications for projects totaling a billion more.

If we refuse to adopt this rule, it is a refusal to give a hearing for a continuation to a policy which we have already adopted. It is the conviction and condemnation of the United States Housing Act of 1937 without arraignment, without plea, and without trial. There is no excuse for refusing to adopt the resolution and considering the bill under this fair and open rule.

This is a momentous occasion for the Democratic Party. I think it means much to us, not only for the present, but for the future of the party. We have solemnly adopted the United States Housing Act of 1937. It is not only this rule that is on trial, it is that act which is on trial. To refuse to pass this resolution would be a confession of error when we passed that act and a confession of incapacity, because it would proclaim to the world that we not only admit we made a mistake when we passed the act, but that we also admit we are not capable of perfecting it; that we are incapable of making it a better act. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to explain the fact that I shall vote for this rule, even though I am opposed to this legislation. I voted for the rule in committee, and I feel it my duty to vote for it on the floor of this House. I have always followed that policy in the brief time I have been on this committee, and I think the House should have an opportunity to consider these matters. Therefore I will vote for the rule, even though I am opposed to the legislation. Of course, there are those of you who are not on the committee who do not have to vote that way. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia rose.

Mr. COLMER. Oh, I cannot yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Just for a question.

Mr. COLMER. Very well. I cannot refuse the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. And if the gentleman were not on the Committee on Rules, I judge he would not feel obligated to vote for the rule.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman from Virginia has a way of drawing fair conclusions. [Laughter and applause.] But I always favor an opportunity for the membership to pass on these questions.

Mr. KELLER rose.

Mr. COLMER. No, Mr. Speaker; I am sorry, I cannot yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I have only two more speakers on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan has only two gentlemen who are brave enough to speak against the rule, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is aware that the expenses of our Government must be kept within its revenues, and that continuation to spend far more than we collect will eventually place our Government in a state of insolvency just the same as any other business that spends more than it makes.

From its very inception I have been opposed to the vast and almost uncontrolled Federal spending as a means of reviving business. I feel that this is not a desirable way nor an effective way to get the wheels of industry turning and get men back to work. Our efforts to resuscitate the fallen giant of industry will bear more fruit if we proceed to remove or at least modify a lot of boards, bureaus, taxes, and other restrictive elements that shackle American industry and agriculture and prevent recovery. However, let it not be said that all Federal spending is wasteful or undesirable. A certain amount of public works should always be authorized so long as there is need for it.

That there is a tremendous need for proper low-cost housing in the cities of this Nation is not debatable. The clearance of slums is a great economic and social necessity of our day and certainly it is a question that transcends all political considerations. The establishment of proper housing and environment for the millions who now dwell in the filth-ridden slums of our great cities is a problem that no man or woman can solve by political equation. It is one that must be met with an open mind and with a firm devotion to our duty of doing everything within our power to promote the "general welfare" of all our people.

The problem of large scale slum clearance is so vast and so urgently pressing that only the Federal Government is capable of handling the situation with any degree of success.

I cannot believe that there is a man or woman in this body who can fail to appreciate the desirability of slum clearance not only as a sound economic policy but one that involves great social betterment for millions. Perhaps there are many here who have no serious slum problem in their districts. The slum is one of the scourges of the large cities, and you, who live in and represent essentially rural areas may not look upon the slums with the same horror that those of us do who come from the large cities. But everyone here does know that the provision of proper housing and proper surroundings for a vast part of our population is a problem of greatest importance.

Before coming to Congress I practiced law in St. Louis for many years. After that I served two terms as prosecuting attorney of St. Louis County. In this capacity I learned of the tremendous necessity and desirability of slum clearance because I saw crime and criminals fostered and bred in the slums.

An amazingly large number of the young and first offenders that reached my office became criminals and social outcasts because of surroundings that were conducive of bad conduct. The Nation's annual crime bill is almost beyond comprehension for a nation that boasts of so many advantages for all. A very large percentage of the offenses are due to improper and unwholesome environment, especially in the large cities. Hence I am convinced that whatever money we spend for the housing program of the United States Housing Authority will be repaid hundreds of times, not in dollars and cents but in social and economic betterment for millions of people. Thousands of laborers, artisans, and mechanics will find work under the program, and generations to come will be improved socially and morally if we have the foresight to begin this great program now. Nothing is so effective in improving business conditions as a construction and building program. Every kind of business is helped by it.

Perhaps the majority of this House in their wisdom will see fit to defer or defeat the housing bill. There can be no quarrel with this body's prerogative to do that if it so desires, and I always have the greatest confidence in the decisions of the majority of this body whether I happen to be on that side or not. But I urge you—yes, even plead with you—to at least consider the bill by voting for the rule so that you may hear our case on the merits of the bill. Certainly it is too important a matter to refuse even the slightest consideration.

The housing bill means a great deal to St. Louis and to every city in this Nation. It means work for the building trades and all the industries that supply and sustain building programs. It means fewer slums and fewer social delinquencies. It means a better America.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who has some valuable information to give to the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the following letter which I received from the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Clerk will read the letter in the time of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Washington, D. C., August 3, 1939.

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Replying to your recent inquiry to me as to the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation relative to the Housing bill, S. 591, under date of January 10 a statement of the American Farm Bureau Federation by its executive committee was submitted to the President of the United States and to all Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which set forth the position of our organization with respect to employment and various recovery measures. From this statement I again quote:

"1. In these critical times, when lack of economic balance between groups of our people prevents normal exchange of goods and services, which in turn results in a continuing unemployment problem, we reiterate our conviction that the full power of the Federal Government must be mobilized in an effort to restore the economic balance which is necessary to enable us, as a Nation, to regain normal volume of production and normal national income. We must put to work our billions of unemployed dollars and our millions of unemployed people."

Among our specific recommendations was the following: "That the Federal Government continue to provide employment for those who cannot secure employment in private industry."

We further recommended: "We insist further that Federal works projects be limited to such constructive projects as can fairly be expected to increase national income and wealth, or to add to the productive efficiency of our national economy."

To the extent that S. 591 meets the requirements as set forth in the foregoing statements with respect to providing useful employment, it will be a factor in national recovery as well as improving the housing conditions in both rural and urban areas.

Sincerely yours,

EDW. A. O'NEAL, President.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, as one who was born in the slums, who was raised in the slums, and who still lives in the slums, I take this opportunity to voice the gratitude of the slum dwellers to the officers and members of the American Farm Bureau Federation for their support of this housing bill, S. 591. [Applause.]

All I can do in this brief moment is to direct my remarks to those who are playing politics with human misery. I ask you to forget politics, to forget your political hatred of Franklin D. Roosevelt, to his opponents; to lay that all aside and go into the slum districts of the big cities. Go into my district on a hot summer night and see American babies sleeping on the fire escapes, gasping for air. I am sure if you saw that sight you would forget playing politics with human misery. Stand on the sidewalks of New York with the people who dwell in the slums when the siren of the fire truck is heard, and watch their faces, observe their eyes filling with fear, and see them wonder as to which relative, whose brother, whose sister, whose mother, whose child is going to be the next victim on the funeral pyre of a slum fire. I say this because these sights, and these sights alone, could stop this disgusting political game that is being played here, with human beings as pawns.

This bill is not pump priming. It is the inexorable next step in the march of human progress. All we ask by this bill is not prosperity, not leisure, but to give to our young Americans their share of air and sunlight with which God has endowed our Nation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FANNIN].



Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is entirely too much of an adventure into the realms of socialism to suit me. My concern for the national credit and for the general welfare of this Nation will not allow me to support it. It comes to us from Mayor LaGuardia and his council of mayors of the metropolitan areas of the United States—an organization which has been endeavoring for several years to have the Congress force upon the country in general the relief problem of the metropolitan centers of this Nation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I cannot yield. I do not have the time.

We have learned much during the past 6 years about relief, and we are due to learn more during the next few years. I myself have learned during the past 6 years that relief must be a local problem; that if we are ever to solve this problem we must solve it locally. I am confident that the housing problem of the United States is of the same character. Day before yesterday we refused to consider a measure brought in here which would have helped the rural population of the United States. The reason we refused consideration of that measure was because we believed that we had already expended as much money this year as we were warranted in expending. For the same reason that I voted against consideration of that measure I intend to vote against consideration of this one. The trend of the times is not toward more concentration in the cities, but the trend of the times is toward the breaking up of large metropolitan centers. This legislation is contrary to the trend of the times, and I hope the rule will be voted down. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I have only one more speaker.

Mr. SABATH. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule will be adopted.

It was said a moment ago that the chairman of the Rules Committee made a blunder when he brought out this bill. I think we will make a big blunder if we do not adopt this rule and pass this bill.

In my opinion, we made a blunder when we built up a prevailing rate of wages amongst mechanics on W. P. A. in the cities for 3 long years and then abolished it. We made another blunder when we reduced the rolls of the W. P. A. 1,000,000. Six hundred and fifty thousand go off the W. P. A. rolls this month. We made another blunder when we failed to adopt the appropriation for \$119,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation to protect the prices of corn, cotton, and other commodities. We will indeed make a blunder if we do not pass this measure that will give the low-income group an opportunity for healthful surroundings, and also create work opportunities for the unemployed that is so desperately needed among the building trades; and if we do not start clearing out the slums and supplanting them with decent surroundings for the workers of this Nation.

I think there is no more important legislation that has come before this session of Congress than this measure. If we defeat this measure I think we will have completed a do-nothing session, insofar as contributing to the recovery of this Nation is concerned. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota. I regret that I do not have more time to give the gentleman.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported here that all of the Representatives from the farming sections of the United States will oppose this rule, because the farmers did not get what they wanted. I want to say that I represent a State where there is no other activity except agriculture. We are about as far removed from New York City as any other State in the Union that is engaged in agriculture. From my section of the country the gentlemen who represent that State in this House are not against the rule. We are not against any rule. We have never been against a rule, because it is a confession of weakness for this

House to decide that we shall not hear the merits of a bill. [Applause.]

I expect to keep my mind judicially inclined and listen to this bill. If it is a good bill I will support it. If it is not, I will vote against it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I only have one other speaker, so I will ask the gentleman from Michigan to use his time.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman has only one more speaker?

Mr. SABATH. That is all.

Mr. MAPES. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Gore].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10½ minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, on day before yesterday I resolved doubt as to the self-liquidating character of the lending bill in favor of its sponsors and voted "aye" on the resolution. Today, on this bill there can be no doubt. The United States Housing Authority program is in no respect self-liquidating. It is not contemplated that any revenue from any project will ever be returned to the United States Government.

The cost of the program is paid in 60 annual payments from the Treasury of the United States. This bill authorizes \$800,000,000 to be loaned, but, mind you, that does not represent the cost of the program. It also authorizes the United States Housing Authority—and, mind you, when you authorize them, it will certainly be done—to make binding contracts for the payment of \$45,000,000 a year for 60 years—\$2,700,000,000. Add that to the \$28,000,000 every year to which we have already been committed, for 60 years, and you have \$73,000,000 a year for 60 years—\$4,380,000,000 to which the passage of this bill will definitely and positively commit the Government.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I decline to yield.

Mr. KELLER. Not for a question?

Mr. GORE. I decline to yield.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. GORE. If I thought the gentleman was seeking information, I would yield. [Laughter.]

The faith and credit of the United States Government is pledged to the fulfillment of these contracts.

The chairman of my committee, whom I dearly love and whom I regret to oppose, will follow me; and I hope he will not say that any of this is misinformation, because it is not misinformation and I would be glad to substantiate every statement I have made in personal conversation with any Member of this House.

The municipalities do not pay one penny of the cost of these projects. Each transaction requires two contracts. Mind you, it is not done in one contract. There is a loan contract and a contribution contract. The contribution contract represents the cost of the program which is—now, listen to this—which is a minimum in every contract of 233 percent of the amount loaned. Some contracts—and I shall be glad to show them to any Member, I have analyzed dozens of them—some contracts pledge the payment of 250 percent of the amount loaned. The Government pays the entire bill. The municipalities get the buildings and the local units get the rent. Not only does the Government pay the entire bill, but it is pledged, and contracted, and bound to amortize the debt at the rate of 3 percent interest; and, mind you, the United States Housing Authority borrows the money at 1½ percent.

If the contracts, if the projects, could be amortized by the Treasury they would be paid completely in a little less than 32 years by making the same payment, the same one, the same specific amount that they bind themselves in these contracts to pay not for 32 years, but for 60 years. Let me illustrate by this simple example. Here is the finance provision: I lend you \$53. I take your note, put it in this pocket; and then I make a side contract with you to pay you \$73, and I take that money out of my other pocket, which is supplied by the taxpayer, put it in the first pocket, pay off the \$53 and proclaim to the world that I have made a profit of \$20.

It is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. I am one of the youngest Members of this House. Even though my people may keep me here for 10 years, for 20 years, for 30 years, for 40 years, or for 50 years, this program will not then be paid for; and every year our appropriation bills will carry an item of \$73,000,000 for this purpose for the next 60 years. My 18-months-old baby will be lucky to live to see one of these contracts consummated. It is ridiculous. How many people can name an apartment house that is inhabitable at the end of 60 years? I turn to another point.

The United States Housing Authority is guilty of disseminating the most reprehensible, deceptive, and misleading information. In spite of this cost I find that on June 2 Mr. Straus made a speech in New Haven, Conn., in which he said—and in order that no claim of misinformation or misquotation can be assigned to me, I read his statement. I quote:

"The loans which the U. S. H. A. makes to localities for financing the capital development of projects are absolutely returnable—every dollar—with interest—"

Listen to this—

"They do not cost the public a penny."

I guess that is where the chairman of the Committee on Rules got his information. [Laughter.]

Mr. SABATH. No; I had studied the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. That is very pleasing. I continue the quotation:

"They do not cost the public a penny, but, in fact, yield a small interest profit."

Mr. Speaker, one must be charitable, and, indeed, modest in selecting his diction to call that "propaganda."

The program is advertised as low-cost housing. It is not low-cost housing. So far this program has cost an average of \$4,893 per family unit, and before we pay ourselves back by this crazy change-of-pocket procedure and doubling the interest on the taxpayers of the country it will cost us for every family unit an average of over \$10,000. One project has cost—and this is a statement from the United States Housing Authority substantiated this morning—one project has cost \$6,710 per family unit, and before we pay ourselves back—mind you, the project never pays one penny to the Government—it will cost in that project over \$14,000 per family unit. I am wondering how many of my colleagues live in such expensive abodes.

The program is advertised as one to rehouse the slum dwellers, and although specifically requested, not one iota of evidence has been presented that as much as one family from the abolished slum area has ever been rehoused in one of these projects. I want to read from the record of the hearings. I do not wish to be misunderstood in making the statement that not as many as one has been rehoused, but I asked for the information, and they could not show me where one had been. I read to you from page 304 of the record of the hearings in regard to the projects which have been opened:

MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE. In these five projects what percentage of the occupants are from the slum areas which were demolished? Mr. STRAUS. From the particular area demolished?

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE. Yes.

Mr. STRAUS. I do not know. I can find out. It is not very important. \* \* \*

I thought it was important!

And that is not misinformation.

It will be said following me, because I know the program and argument, that we have adopted a policy, that it should go on, and that we should not stop it. Well, England adopted it, as you have heard, and within 3 years they stopped it. Why? Because a catastrophe was impending for the exchequer.

Mr. Speaker, something was said about blunders. I do not subscribe to the theory that because we as representatives of the people, we as Democrats or as a Congress, have made a blunder or a mistake, we should keep right on and carry it through. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. STEAGALL], who is not a new Member, but who has served here and on that committee for over 20 years.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall not contend that if this House recognizes that a mistake has been made in passing the original legislation that we should not correct that mistake. I do call attention to the fact, however, that the bill before the House is simply a provision for the continuation of a program upon which the House has voted affirmatively at least three or four different times, and that this program should not be interrupted without full consideration of results. Since the program was begun projects have been inaugurated in all but 17 States and 38 States have passed enabling legislation for organization of local housing authorities. The problem of housing is one that challenges the sympathetic efforts of every Member of the House. It pertains not alone to our cities, but conditions that cry out to us are spread throughout the length and breadth of the Nation. The legislation is national in purpose and will benefit the people of the entire Nation.

The cities were the first beneficiaries of our efforts for relief, but those who were responsible for this legislation had a vision that swept beyond the confines of the cities of the country. Those of us who come from rural areas know that conditions there parallel the unfortunate conditions that have been depicted in some of the cities of the Nation. Slum housing in rural areas is just as deplorable as is the case in urban centers. The inauguration of this great reform has been successful to an extent that exceeds our expectations.

Under the act as it was initially passed and approved in September 1937, the United States Housing Authority was authorized to issue bonds in an amount not to exceed a total of \$500,000,000, \$100,000,000 of which was to be available the first year and \$200,000,000 the second and third years. That act also authorized annual contributions in an aggregate amount of \$20,000,000, \$5,000,000 to be available the first year and \$7,500,000 the second and third years. In June of 1938, amendments were adopted which increased the bond authorization to \$800,000,000 and made the full amount immediately available. The amendments increased the annual contribution authorization to \$28,000,000 and made the full amount immediately available. This annual contribution authorization has, however, been sufficient to cover projects involving only about \$650,000,000 in Federal loans, plus the 10 percent local capital participation.

The amendment to the bill proposed by the committee authorizes the United States Housing Authority to issue its bonds for an additional \$800,000,000. The proceeds of these bonds would be available for loans of not more than 90 percent of the cost of projects undertaken by local public-housing agencies. This increased authorization is an authority merely to borrow that sum, which will be used for loans that will be fully repayable to the United States Housing Authority with interest.

The bill authorizes the United States Housing Authority to contract for the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in the additional amount of \$45,000,000. These annual contributions will cover projects financed with the proceeds of the additional bonds of the United States Housing Authority in the amount of \$800,000,000 and the amount of \$150,000,000 unexpended. These contributions are intended to make up the difference between the rent which would otherwise have to be charged for decent new housing and the rent which the families living in slums can now afford to pay. The bill authorizes the extension of the program to families of low income in rural areas. Of the funds available to the United States Housing Authority for loans, \$200,000,000 are earmarked to provide housing for families of low income in rural areas.

The program to be carried out if this proposal is passed would rehouse 500,000 families in the United States. It will provide new housing facilities for 2,000,000 people—certainly not less than 1,500,000—in the United States, of whom more than one-half million would be in rural areas.



The statement has been made that residents in the slum sections of our cities have not in reality been rehoused. The program is just getting under way, and projects under construction cannot be used before completion. Under the present program 365 projects are under way and some of them finished and occupied. There is demand now for more funds than is provided in the measure under consideration, but the program will have to proceed in an orderly way. It is not calculated that funds to be made available under this bill will be exhausted in less than 2 years.

This bill would afford employment for one-half million men for a period of 1 year. It is estimated that in connection with expenditures of this kind three times the amount of those directly expended will be employed in the expansion of trade and in labor to be put to work in carrying out contracts for the erection of buildings and otherwise.

The record shows that down to this time, instead of costing \$6,000 per dwelling, the cost is not above \$4,000, and it is being gradually reduced lower than contemplated in the original act. We have now approached the time when the cost of these structures will average \$3,500 or less. On an average, they have never exceeded the limits established in the original law of \$5,000 per unit and \$1,250 per room for the more expensive construction in the larger cities, and \$4,000 per unit and \$1,000 per room elsewhere.

I desire to call attention of Members of the House to the provision in this bill for rural housing. Two hundred million dollars have been earmarked for the relief of slum conditions that obtain in the rural sections of the country. Enabling legislation passed in 17 States provides for the organization of local housing authorities in rural areas. The Secretary of Agriculture testified that the program can be extended to several areas in every State in the Union under local laws or under the Farm Home Corporation in the Department of Agriculture. I believe that the program is less difficult of administration in rural areas than in urban centers. There is on hand \$150,000,000 of the funds available to inaugurate a system of low-cost housing in rural areas, without the requirement of the 10-percent cash contribution required under the bill now before us, which is a departure from existing law.

Under this bill any local housing authority must first contribute 10 percent in cash of any loan to be made.

Mr. SIROVICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SIROVICH. The distinguished gentleman who has been battling for slum clearance has made a very interesting contribution; but I want to call his attention to the fact that although the United States Housing Authority assisted projects are built for 60 years with labor paid the prevailing wages, the average net construction cost of these projects is more than \$1,000 less than the comparable figure for private residential construction of all types.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is quite true, and I thank the gentleman.

I wish to call attention to the figures that have been given, which are calculated to give an exaggerated and unjust impression respecting the provisions of this bill.

The amount of annual contributions carried in this bill for the purpose of maintaining the low-rent quality of houses to be afforded the unfortunate people who are to benefit by this legislation is not such as has been pictured. The rate of interest paid by the United States Housing Authority at this time is 1½ percent. The rate of interest charged on loans is 3 percent. So that you have a margin of 1½ percent upon which to operate, and when we take into account earnings on the margin between the cost of the money and the rate applied, and apply that to annual contributions, it will reduce annual contributions to \$50,000,000. That is what the actual figures show.

Contrary to statements that have been made, not technically misleading, but calculated to create misunderstanding with reference to this bill, it is a loan bill insofar as the

money supplied to aid the local housing authorities in the construction of buildings is concerned. They are loans that will be repaid and loans that we have a right to expect will be repaid. The gentlemen who oppose us proceed with the figures handed us. I answer on a basis of the same figures that have been handed us. If they are correct when offered by the gentlemen who have preceded me, they should not be questioned when offered by me. On the basis of these figures we are justified in the statement that the difference of 1½ percent between the cost of money and the interest charged on loans if applied against annual contributions will reduce them to \$50,000,000 a year.

The bill provides for full repayment of loans but not to the Treasury for the reason that the Treasury does not part with a dollar. The Treasury does not furnish the money and the Treasury, of course, does not get the money back. The United States Housing Authority uses the credit of the Federal Treasury to borrow money, and the bill provides that the money will be returned to the United States Housing Authority for payment of its obligations.

The way in which figures are presented to this House would give an unjust impression. If we take any annual appropriation and multiply it by 60 the total will be appalling.

Such a calculation on the figures in this bill is far less staggering than it would be if applied to any of our various annual appropriations such as national defense, veterans' benefits, agricultural adjustment, and others made on that basis. It is not a fair way to present it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 169, nays 191, answered "present" 1, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—169

Anderson, Mo.	Eberharter	Kilday	Robinson, Utah
Arnold	Edmiston	Kirwan	Rogers, Okla.
Barry	Ellis	Kocalkowski	Romjue
Beam	Evans	Kramer	Sabath
Beckworth	Fay	Larrabee	Sacks
Bloom	Flaherty	Lea	Sasser
Boland	Flannagan	Leavy	Schuetz
Boykin	Flannery	Lemke	Schulte
Bradley, Pa.	Fries	McAndrews	Scrugham
Brown, Ga.	Fulmer	McArdle	Seger
Bryson	Gavagan	McCormack	Shanley
Buck	Gehrmann	McKeough	Shannon
Buckley, N. Y.	Gerlach	McLaughlin	Sheppard
Bulwinkle	Geyer, Calif.	McMillan, John L.	Sirovich
Burdick	Gibbs	Maclejewski	Smith, Conn.
Burgin	Grant, Ala.	Mahon	Smith, Ill.
Byrne, N. Y.	Gregory	Maloney	Smith, Wash.
Byrns, Tenn.	Griffith	Marcantonio	Snyder
Byron	Hart	Martin, Colo.	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Harter, N. Y.	Martin, Ill.	Sparkman
Cannon, Mo.	Harter, Ohio	Merritt	Spence
Cartwright	Havenner	Miller	Steagall
Casey, Mass.	Healey	Mills, La.	Sullivan
Celler	Hendricks	Moser	Sutphin
Chandler	Hennings	Mouton	Tenerowicz
Claypool	Hill	Murdock, Ariz.	Terry
Cochran	Hobbs	Murdock, Utah	Thomas, Tex.
Coffee, Wash.	Hull	Myers	Thomason
Cole, Md.	Hunter	Nelson	Tolan
Colmer	Izac	Norton	Vinson, Ga.
Connery	Jarman	O'Connor	Voorhis, Calif.
Cooper	Jeffries	O'Leary	Wallgren
Crosser	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Toole	Walter
Cullen	Johnson, Okla.	Pace	Ward
D'Alesandro	Johnson, W. Va.	Parsons	Weaver
Darden	Jones, Tex.	Patrick	Welch
Delaney	Kee	Patton	Whelchel
Dempsey	Keller	Peterson, Fla.	Williams, Mo.
DeRouen	Kelly	Pfeifer	Wood
Dickstein	Kennedy, Md.	Ramspeck	Zimmerman
Doughton	Kennedy, Michael	Randolph	
Duncan	Keogh	Rayburn	
Dunn	Kerr		

## NAYS—191

Alexander	Doxey	Johns	Rich
Allen, Ill.	Drewry	Johnson, Ill.	Risk
Allen, La.	Durham	Johnson, Luther A.	Robertson
Allen, Pa.	Dworschak	Jones, Ohio	Rodgers, Pa.
Andersen, H. Carl	Elliott	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Elston	Keefe	Routzohn
Andresen, A. H.	Engel	Kinzer	Rutherford
Andrews	Englebright	Kitchens	Sandager
Angell	Faddis	Kleberg	Satterfield
Arends	Fenton	Lambertson	Schafer, Wis.
Ashbrook	Ferguson	Landis	Schiffler
Austin	Folger	LeCompte	Secombe
Barden	Ford, Leland M.	Lewis, Colo.	Shafer, Mich.
Barton	Ford, Miss.	Lewis, Ohio	Simpson
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	Luce	Smith, Maine
Bell	Garrett	McDowell	Smith, Ohio
Bender	Gartner	McGehee	Smith, Va.
Blackney	Gathings	McLean	Smith, W. Va.
Bland	Gearhart	McLeod	South
Boehne	Gifford	Maas	Springer
Bolles	Gilchrist	Mapes	Starnes, Ala.
Bolton	Gillie	Marshall	Sumner, Ill.
Bradley, Mich.	Gore	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Brewster	Gossett	Martin, Mass.	Talle
Brooks	Graham	Mason	Tarver
Brown, Ohio	Grant, Ind.	May	Taylor, Tenn.
Carlson	Gross	Michener	Thomas, N. J.
Carter	Guyer, Kans.	Mills, Ark.	Thorkelson
Case, S. Dak.	Gwynne	Monkiewicz	Tibbott
Chipperfield	Hall	Monroney	Tinkham
Church	Halleck	Mott	Treadway
Clark	Hancock	Mundt	Van Zandt
Clason	Hare	Murray	Vorys, Ohio
Clevenger	Harness	Nichols	Vreeland
Cole, N. Y.	Hartley	Norrell	Wadsworth
Corbett	Hawks	O'Brien	Warren
Costello	Heinke	Oliver	West
Courtney	Hess	Osmer	Wheat
Cox	Hinshaw	Pearson	White, Ohio
Crawford	Hoffman	Peterson, Ga.	Whittington
Culkin	Hope	Pierce, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Curtis	Horton	Pierce, Oreg.	Williams, Del.
Darrow	Houston	Pittenger	Winter
Dirksen	Jacobsen	Plumley	Wolcott
Disney	Jarrett	Poage	Wolfenden, Pa.
Ditter	Jenkins, Ohio	Polk	Woodrum, Va.
Dondero	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, Ill.	Youngdahl
Dowell	Jensen	Rees, Kans.	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Robison, Ky.

## NOT VOTING—67

Ball	Dies	Lanham	Rockefeller
Barnes	Dingell	Lesinski	Ryan
Bates, Ky.	Douglas	Ludlow	Schaefer, Ill.
Boren	Eaton, Calif.	McGranery	Schwert
Buckler, Minn.	Eaton, N. J.	McMillan, Thos. S.	Secret
Burch	Fernandez	Magnuson	Short
Caldwell	Fish	Mansfield	Stearns, N. H.
Chapman	Fitzpatrick	Massingale	Stefan
Cluett	Ford, Thomas F.	Mitchell	Sumners, Tex.
Coffee, Nebr.	Green	O'Neal	Sweeney
Collins	Harrington	Patman	Taylor, Colo.
Cooley	Holmes	Powers	Thill
Creal	Hook	Rabaut	Vincent, Ky.
Crowe	Johnson, Ind.	Rankin	White, Idaho
Crowther	Kennedy, Martin	Reece, Tenn.	Wolverton, N. J.
Cummings	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff, Mich.
Curley	Kunkel	Richards	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. BANKHEAD, and he answered "yea."

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bates of Kentucky (for) with Mr. Robison of Kentucky (against).  
 Mr. Buckler of Minnesota (for) with Mr. Knutson (against).  
 Mr. Rankin (for) with Mr. Douglas (against).  
 Mr. Powers (for) with Mr. Thill (against).  
 Mr. Dingell (for) with Mr. Reece of Tennessee (against).  
 Mr. Rabaut (for) with Mr. Thomas S. McMillan (against).  
 Mr. Ball (for) with Mr. Cluett (against).  
 Mr. Crowe (for) with Mr. Coffee of Nebraska (against).  
 Mr. Sweeney (for) with Mr. Chapman (against).  
 Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey (for) with Mr. Rockefeller (against).  
 Mr. Creal (for) with Mr. Crowther (against).  
 Mr. Hook (for) with Mr. Reed of New York (against).  
 Mr. Magnuson (for) with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan (against).  
 Mr. Lesinski (for) with Mr. Ryan (against).

General pairs:

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Fish.  
 Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Holmes.  
 Mr. Caldwell with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.  
 Mr. Lanham with Mr. Short.  
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.  
 Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Stefan.  
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Eaton of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Barnes with Mr. Eaton of California.  
 Mr. Cummings with Mr. Secret.  
 Mr. Massingale with Mr. White of Idaho.  
 Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Dies.  
 Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Green.  
 Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Fernandez.  
 Mr. Thomas F. Ford with Mr. Mitchell.  
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Vincent of Kentucky.  
 Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Collins.  
 Mr. Boren with Mr. Patman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. BATES. If the gentleman from Kentucky were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. JOHN L. McMILLAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was rejected was laid on the table.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues the gentlemen from New York, Mr. CURLEY and Mr. FITZPATRICK, both of whom are ill, were present, they would have voted "yea" on the resolution. My colleagues the gentlemen from New York, Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY and Mr. SCHWERT, and the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RICHARDS, are unavoidably detained. If they were present, they would have voted "yea" on the resolution.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had ordered that the Secretary be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5982) entitled "An act for the protection against unlawful use of the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of veterans' organizations incorporated by act of Congress, and providing penalties for the violation thereof."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2697) entitled "An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 7270) entitled "An act to amend the Bonneville Project Act," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BAILEY, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## PAYMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES FROM OSAGE TRIBAL FUNDS

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4117) to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma, Mr. O'CONNOR, and Mr. BURDICK.

## CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2133) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Nevada.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill that I have asked be considered at this time has passed the Senate and is now before the House. There are no amendments. This bill authorizes the conveyance of certain lands to the State of Nevada, and that is all it does. The bill contains the



usual reservation to the United States of mineral rights. There is no objection whatever to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the State of Nevada all right, title, and interest of the United States in the following-described area: The northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 11, township 43 north, range 51 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, in part satisfaction of the grant to the State for university purposes made by the act of July 4, 1866 (14 Stat. 85): *Provided*, That the patent issued to the State for this tract shall contain a reservation to the United States for all oil, gas, and other mineral deposits, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WENATCHEE NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5747) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wenatchee National Forest, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the period, add the following sentence: "Lands received in exchange or purchased under the provisions of this act shall be open to mineral locations, mineral development, and patent, in accordance with the mining laws of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LOUISE WOHL

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6435) to authorize cancellation of deportation in the case of Louise Wohl, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 11, insert:

"Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the quota during the current year."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 291) authorizing and requesting the President to accept the invitation of the Government of Norway to the Government of the United States to participate in an International Exhibition of Polar Exploration, which will be held at Bergen, Norway, in 1940, and authorizing an appropriation to cover the expenses of such participation.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman is prepared to offer an amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. I have an amendment on the Clerk's desk reducing the amount to \$15,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 137) may be considered in lieu of the House joint resolution and that the Foreign

Affairs Committee be discharged from consideration of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President is hereby authorized and requested to accept the invitation extended by the Government of Norway to the Government of the United States to participate in an International Exhibition of Polar Exploration, which is to be held at Bergen, Norway, in 1940.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to appoint a commissioner to represent the United States at the exhibition, who will serve in this capacity without compensation; or the President is authorized to designate, upon the nomination of the Secretary of State, a permanent Government official as commissioner to represent the United States at the exhibition, who will serve in this capacity without additional compensation. The expenses of the commissioner and such staff as he may need to assist him will be met out of funds provided for the purposes of Government participation in the exhibition. The duties of the commissioner and his assistants shall be prescribed by the Secretary of State. The other departments of the Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of State or his authorized representatives in preparing the exhibit.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State is authorized to employ such assistants as may be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution, and to fix their reasonable compensation without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to purchase such materials, contract for such labor and other services as may be necessary, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5). The Secretary of State may delegate to the commissioner or other officer any of the powers vested in him by this resolution as may be deemed advisable.

SEC. 4. In order to defray the expenses of representation of the United States at the exhibition, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; transportation of things; traveling and subsistence expenses; rent and heating, light, and maintenance services; printing and binding; selection, purchase, assembling, preparation, transportation, arrangement, safekeeping, demonstration, removing, repairing, and altering of an exhibit or exhibits, including the preparation of an exhibit plan; official cards; entertainment; hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; communication service; purchase or rental of furniture and equipment; stationery and supplies, books of reference, and periodicals, newspapers, and other appropriate publications, maps, reports, documents, plans, specifications, and manuscripts; and ice and drinking water for office use: *Provided*, That arrangements for telephone services, rents, and subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals may be made in advance; and such other expenses as may be necessary in the opinion of the Secretary of State to carry out the purposes of this resolution; the sum of \$35,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended for the purposes of this joint resolution, and any unexpended balances shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States. All expenditures shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State and payable upon his certification: *Provided further*, That he is authorized in his discretion to delegate this authority to the commissioner or such other officer as he may deem advisable. Such expenditures shall not be subject to the provisions of any law regulating or limiting expenditure of public money other than this resolution, but this provision shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit, or permit any indebtedness to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 5. The heads of the various executive departments and independent offices and establishments of the Government are authorized and directed to assist the Secretary of State, or such other officers of the Government as may be designated or appointed by the Secretary of State, to assemble the exhibit, in the procurement, installation, and display of an exhibit or exhibits; to lend such materials, articles, manuscripts, documents, papers, specimens, and exhibits as the Secretary of State shall deem to be in the interest of the United States in carrying out the purposes of this resolution; and to contract for such labor or other services as may be requested by the Secretary of State, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5).

SEC. 6. The commissioner or officer in charge of the preparation of the exhibit, with the approval of the Secretary of State, may receive from any source contributions of material to aid in carrying out the general purposes of this resolution, and at the close of the exhibition or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases shall, under the direction of the Secretary of State, return the articles so contributed to the source from which they came, or dispose of them, or such portion thereof as may be unused, and account therefor.

SEC. 7. Any expenses incident to the restoration of any of the property assembled under the provisions of this resolution to such a condition which will permit its use at subsequent exhibitions or

celebrations, and for the continued employment of personnel necessary to close out the fiscal and other records and to prepare the reports, may be paid from the appropriation authorized herein.

Sec. 8. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to transmit to the Congress within 6 months after the close of the exhibition a detailed statement of all expenditures, together with such other reports as may be deemed proper, which reports shall be prepared and arranged with a view to concise statement and convenient reference.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 23, strike out "\$35,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will pass. It is extremely fitting that we should be represented at the Polar Exploration Exposition at Bergen, Norway. Norway has always been our very good friend, and the United States polar explorations have been most notable. We, in Massachusetts, are especially interested, due to the fact that Admiral Richard Byrd has made such extremely valuable contributions.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 291) was laid on the table.

#### APPORTIONMENT OF COST BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE OWNERS OF CERTAIN BRIDGES

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1989) to provide for the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States, for the apportionment of the cost of such alterations between the United States and the owners of such bridges, and for other purposes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the transportation bill that was passed last week contained a provision about the apportionment of the cost of alterations of bridges between the Government and the railroads when they were ordered changed or rebuilt by any of the departments of the Government. There will not be any agreement in conference on the bill before January, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is interested in a matter down in his district and would like the legislation to take effect so far as the bridge matter is concerned now. This is practically the section that was in the transportation bill passed last week with regard to bridges.

Mr. TABER. It has to do with bridge matters and nothing else?

Mr. CROSSER. Nothing else but bridges.

Mr. TABER. And the committee has all agreed to it?

Mr. CROSSER. Yes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

#### DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. When used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise—

The term "alteration" includes changes of any kind and reconstruction.

The term "bridge" means a lawful bridge over navigable waters of the United States, including approaches thereto, used and operated for the purpose of carrying railroad traffic, or both railroad and highway traffic.

The term "bridge owner" means any corporation, association, partnership, or individual owning any bridge, and when any bridge shall be in the possession or under the control of any trustee, receiver, trustee in bankruptcy, or lessee, said term shall include both the owner of the legal title and the person or entity in possession or control of such bridge.

The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of War acting directly or through the Chief of Engineers.

The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the Territories and possessions of the United States.

#### OBSTRUCTION OF NAVIGATION

SEC. 2. No bridge shall at any time unreasonably obstruct the free navigation of any navigable waters of the United States.

#### NOTICE, HEARINGS, AND FINDINGS

SEC. 3. Whenever any bridge shall, in the opinion of the Secretary, at any time unreasonably obstruct such navigation, it shall be the duty of the Secretary, after notice to interested parties, to hold a hearing at which the bridge owner, those interested in water navigation thereunder or therethrough, those interested in either railroad or highway traffic thereover, and any other party or parties in interest shall have full opportunity to offer evidence and be heard as to whether any alteration of such bridge is needed, and if so what alterations are needed, having due regard to the necessity of free and unobstructed water navigation and to the necessities of the rail or highway traffic. If, upon such hearing, the Secretary determines that any alterations of such bridge are necessary in order to render navigation through or under it reasonably free, easy, and unobstructed, having due regard also for the necessities of rail or highway traffic thereover, he shall so find and shall issue and cause to be served upon interested parties an order requiring such alterations of such bridge as he finds to be reasonably necessary for the purposes of navigation.

#### SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF GENERAL PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the bridge owner to prepare and submit to the Secretary, within 90 days after service of his order, general plans and specifications to provide for the alteration of such bridge in accordance with such order, and for such additional alteration of such bridge as the bridge owner may desire to meet the necessities of railroad or highway traffic, or both. The Secretary may approve or reject such general plans and specifications, in whole or in part, and may require the submission of new or additional plans and specifications, but when the Secretary shall have approved general plans and specifications, they shall be final and binding upon all parties unless changes therein be afterward approved by the Secretary and the bridge owner.

#### CONTRACTS FOR PROJECT; GUARANTY OF COST

SEC. 5. After approval of such general plans and specifications by the Secretary, and within 90 days after notification of such approval, the bridge owner shall, in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe, take bids for the alteration of such bridge in accordance with such general plans and specifications. All bids, including any bid for all or part of the project submitted by the bridge owner, shall be submitted to the Secretary, together with a recommendation by the bridge owner as to the most competent bid or bids, and at the same time the bridge owner shall submit to the Secretary a written guaranty that the total cost of the project, including the cost of such work as is to be performed by the bridge owner and not included in the work to be performed by contract, shall not exceed the sum stated in said guaranty. The Secretary may direct the bridge owner to reject all bids and to take new bids, or may authorize the bridge owner to proceed with the project, by contract, or partly by contract and partly by the bridge owner, or wholly by the bridge owner. Upon such authorization and fixing of the proportionate shares of the cost as provided in section 6, the bridge owner shall, within a reasonable time to be prescribed by the Secretary, proceed with the work of alteration; and the cost thereof shall be borne by the United States and by the bridge owner, as hereinafter provided.

#### APPORTIONMENT OF COST

SEC. 6. At the time the Secretary shall authorize the bridge owner to proceed with the project, as provided in section 5, and after an opportunity to the bridge owner to be heard thereon, the Secretary shall determine and issue an order specifying the proportionate shares of the total cost of the project to be borne by the United States and by the bridge owner. Such apportionment shall be made on the following basis: The bridge owner shall bear such part of the cost as is attributable to the direct and special benefits which will accrue to the bridge owner as a result of the alteration, and the United States shall bear the balance of the cost. In such direct and special benefits shall be included additional length of life or period of usefulness of a bridge. In apportioning cost due allowance to the bridge owner shall be made for the present value of bridge replaced at the time of replacement.

#### PAYMENT OF SHARE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 7. When the Secretary shall have approved the general plans and specifications for the alteration of such bridge and the guaranty with respect to the cost thereof, and shall have fixed the proportionate shares thereof as between the United States and the bridge owner, he shall furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury a certified copy of his approval of such plans and specifications and guaranty, and of his order fixing the proportionate shares of the United States and of the bridge owner, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon set aside, out of any appropriation available for such purpose, the share of the United States payable under this act on account of the project. When the Secretary finds that such project has been completed in accordance with his order, he shall cause to be paid to the bridge owner, out of the funds so set aside, the proportionate share of the total cost of the project allocated to the United States; or he may, in his discretion, from time to time, cause payments to be made on such construction costs as the work progresses. The total payments out of Federal funds shall not exceed the proportionate share of the United States of the total cost of the project paid or incurred by the bridge owner, and, if such total cost exceeds the cost guaranteed by the bridge owner, shall not exceed the proportionate share of



the United States of such guaranteed cost, except that if the cost of the work exceeds the guaranteed cost by reason of emergencies, conditions beyond the control of the owner, or unforeseen or undetermined conditions, the Secretary may, after full review of all the circumstances, provide for additional payments by the United States to help defray such excess cost to the extent he deems to be reasonable and proper, and shall certify such additional payments to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment. All payments to any bridge owner herein provided for shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury on warrants drawn by the Secretary, payable to the bridge owner.

#### APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH ORDERS; PENALTIES; REMOVAL OF BRIDGE

Sec. 9. Any bridge owner who shall willfully fail or refuse to remove a bridge, or so much thereof as may have been found by the Secretary to be an unreasonable obstruction to navigation, or to comply with any lawful order of the Secretary, made in accordance with the provisions of this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished in any court of competent jurisdiction by a fine not exceeding \$5,000, and every month such bridge owner shall remain in default shall be deemed a new offense and subject such bridge owner to additional penalties therefor. In addition to the penalties above prescribed the Secretary may, upon the failure or refusal of any bridge owner to comply with any lawful order issued by the Secretary in regard thereto, cause the removal of any such bridge and accessory works at the expense of the bridge owner; and suit for such expense may be brought in the name of the United States against such bridge owner and recovery had for such expense in any court of competent jurisdiction. The removal of any bridge erected or maintained in violation of the provisions of this act or the order or direction of the Secretary made in pursuance thereof, and compliance with any order of the Secretary made with respect to any bridge in accordance with the provisions of this act, may be enforced by injunction, mandamus, or other summary process upon application to the district court of any district in which such bridge may, in whole or in part, exist, and proper proceedings to this end may be instituted under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States at the request of the Secretary.

#### REVIEW OF FINDINGS AND ORDERS

Sec. 10. Any order made or issued under section 6 of this act may be reviewed by the circuit court of appeals for any judicial circuit in which the bridge in question is wholly or partly located, if a petition for such review is filed within 3 months after the date such order is issued. The judgment of any such court shall be final except that it shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certification or certiorari, in the manner provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended. The review by such Court shall be limited to questions of law, and the findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. Upon such review, such Court shall have power to affirm or, if the order is not in accordance with law, to modify or to reverse the order, with or without remanding the case for a rehearing as justice may require. Proceedings under this section shall not operate as a stay of any order of the Secretary issued under provisions of this act other than section 6, or relieve any bridge owner of any liability or penalty under such provisions.

#### REGULATIONS AND ORDERS

Sec. 11. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations, and to make and issue such orders, as may be necessary or appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this act.

#### EXISTING PROVISIONS OF LAW

Sec. 12. The first sentence of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 494), and section 18 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1899 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 502), shall be inapplicable with respect to any bridge to which the provisions of this act are applicable; and, in any case in which any requirement under either of such sections has been made with respect to the alteration of any bridge and such alteration had not been begun prior to January 1, 1939, the provisions of this act shall be applicable with respect to such alteration, and the Secretary shall make such additional findings and orders and take such other action as may be necessary in order to provide that such alteration will be made as nearly as possible in conformity with the provisions of this act.

#### RELOCATION OF BRIDGES

Sec. 13. If the owner of any bridge used for railroad traffic and the Secretary shall agree that in order to remove an obstruction to navigation, or for any other purpose, a relocation of such bridge or the construction of a new bridge upon a new location would be preferable to an alteration of the existing bridge, such relocation or new construction may be carried out at such new site and upon such terms as may be acceptable to the bridge owner and the Secretary, and the cost of such relocation or new construction, including also any expense of changes in and additions to rights-of-way, stations, tracks, spurs, sidings, switches, signals, and other railroad facilities and property, and relocation of shippers required

for railroad connection with the bridge at the new site, shall be apportioned as between the bridge owner and the United States in the manner which is provided for in section 6 hereof in the case of an alteration and the share of the United States paid from the appropriation authorized in section 8 hereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as requiring the United States to pay any part of the expense of building any bridge across a navigable stream which the Secretary of War shall not find to be in fact a relocation of an existing bridge.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "kind and reconstruction." and insert in lieu thereof, "kind, reconstruction, or removal in whole or in part."

Page 5, strike out after "and" in line 17 the balance of line 17 and all of lines 18 to 22, inclusive, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "that part of the cost attributable to the requirements of traffic by railroad or highway, or both, including any expenditure for increased carrying capacity of the bridge, and including such proportion of the actual capital cost of the old bridge or of such part of the old bridge as may be altered or changed or rebuilt as the used service life of the whole or a part, as the case may be, bears to the total estimated service life of the whole or such part. The United States shall bear the balance of the cost, including that part attributable to the necessities of navigation."

Page 7, strike out all after "refuse to" in line 16, down to and including "or to" in line 18.

Pages 9 and 10, strike out all of section 12, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Sec. 12. (a) The first sentence of section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 494), and section 18 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1899 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 33, sec. 502), shall be inapplicable with respect to any bridge to which the provisions of this act are applicable, except to the extent provided in this section.

"(b) Any bridge, the construction, reconstruction, or alteration of which was required by an order of the Secretary issued prior to July 1, 1939, and was not completed on such date, and in the case of which no penalties have accrued at the time of the enactment of this act, shall be constructed, reconstructed, or altered as required by such order, and not in accordance with the provisions of this act. In the case of any such bridge, however, the Secretary shall apportion the cost of the project between the bridge owner and the United States, and payment of the share of the United States shall be made, in the same manner as if the provisions of this act applied to such construction, reconstruction, or alteration, subject to the following limitations:

"(1) In case such construction, reconstruction, or alteration has not begun on the date of enactment of this act, such apportionment of cost shall be made only if (A) the construction, reconstruction, or alteration is carried out in accordance with plans and specifications, and pursuant to bids, approved by the Secretary, and (B) the bridge owner has submitted to the Secretary, a written guaranty of cost as provided for in section 5.

"(2) The Secretary's determination as to such apportionment, and as to such plans and specifications and bids, shall be final.

"(3) Such apportionment shall not be made if such construction, reconstruction, or alteration is not completed within the time fixed in such order of the Secretary or within such additional time (not to exceed 25 percent of the time allowed in the order for such completion) as the Secretary, for good cause shown, may allow.

"(c) Any bridge (except a bridge to which subsection (b) applies) the construction, reconstruction, or alteration of which was required by an order of the Secretary issued prior to July 1, 1939, and was not begun before such date, shall be subject to the provisions of this act as though such order had not been issued, and compliance with the provisions of this act and with such orders as may be issued thereunder shall be considered to constitute compliance with such order issued prior to July 1, 1939, and with the provisions of law under which it was issued."

Page 11, line 7, after "nothing", strike out "herein", and insert "in this section".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN ULLMANN, JR.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2427, authorizing the naturalization of John Ullmann, Jr., and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2427 and consider the same, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, John Ullmann, Jr., of the United States Navy, retired, may be naturalized as a citizen of the United States by taking the naturalization oath of allegiance before any court having jurisdiction of the naturalization of aliens.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this bill (S. 2427) is one of the most meritorious naturalization bills that has ever come to my attention. It will authorize the naturalization of John Ullmann, Jr., at any time within 1 year, by the taking of the naturalization oath of allegiance by Mr. Ullmann before any court having jurisdiction of the naturalization of aliens. It appears that Mr. Ullmann was born in Russia in 1884 and came to this country with his parents in 1892. The father, John Ullmann, Sr., took out his first papers in Clay County, Nebr., in 1893. They were under the mistaken belief that this was all that was required and that such action conferred citizenship upon the entire family, some of whom moved to South Dakota.

It was not until 1914 that Mr. Ullmann, Sr., received his final papers at which time John Ullmann, Jr., had reached his majority. In 1906 he enlisted in the Navy and at that time his citizenship was established to the satisfaction of the Navy Department officials upon an affidavit by the father. In 1914 his citizenship was again established upon a similar affidavit to the satisfaction of the Navy Department. Mr. Ullmann was retired at Shanghai, China, in 1936, upon the completion of 30 years' service. He immediately was appointed as an assistant deputy United States marshal in Shanghai, which position he held for 18 months. Since that time he has been employed by two or three American tobacco firms, representing their interests in China. He returned to this country in February of this year on a visit and was admitted as a citizen upon the presentation of his Navy papers. During the month of April he learned definitely that he did not acquire citizenship upon the naturalization of his father and immediately filed a declaration of intention, however, under the regular procedure, it will be 5 years before he can receive his final papers.

Mr. Ullmann has a wife and four children in Shanghai and they, of course, cannot come to this country until his citizenship is established and neither can he obtain a passport to return to China. He had an excellent record while in the United States Navy.

The consideration of the House in passing S. 2427 to meet this situation is appreciated.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BRIEN M'MAHON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2478) to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases, and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2478, and consider the same. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain what this bill is?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill extends the statutory period so that Mr. McMahon, who was an Assistant Attorney General, may try the Harlan County cases over again without having the 2-year period apply to him. It does not involve any additional appointment. It merely permits the 2-year period to start from the time he left the employment of the Department of Justice.

Mr. TABER. Does this call for any additional expense?

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. TABER. And it relates specifically to him and not to anyone else?

Mr. WALTER. Not to anyone else.

Mr. HANCOCK. He was employed as a special counsel to try these cases, and this is to permit him to proceed with the cases of which he has had charge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the employment of Brien McMahon as an attorney or counselor specially employed, retained, or appointed by the Attorney General or under authority of the Department of Justice, at a compensation not to exceed the rate of \$10,000 per annum, to assist in the conduct of the case of United States against Mary Helen Corporation and others, in the eastern district of Kentucky, and the case of Société Suisse pour Valeurs de Metaux, petitioner, against Homer S. Cummings, Attorney General of the United States, and William A. Julian, Treasurer of the United States, in the District of Columbia, including all proceedings therein and any other case or proceeding, appellate or otherwise, that may arise out of or pertain to the matters or any of them involved in the said cases, shall not be construed to be employment within the meaning of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 99).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN TELEPHONE EXCHANGES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1234) to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938," and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is this?

Mr. RAMSPECK. This is the so-called rural telephone exchange exemption. I think everyone is in favor of it. I talked with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and he is agreeable to this.

Mr. RICH. We may not object to this particular provision, but the gentleman has a lot of things in the National Labor Relations Act that ought to be changed. Can we expect any relief on that legislation which is anticipated by the people of this country?

Mr. RAMSPECK. This has nothing to do with the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. RICH. This is the Wage and Hour Act?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. RICH. There are other features which the gentleman's committee is interested in, and are we to get any relief from that?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I cannot tell about that.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman tell how far this goes?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It simply exempts from the wage and hour provisions switchboard operators employed in telephone exchanges having less than 500 stations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled the "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938," be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding a new subsection 11 as follows: "or (11) any switchboard operator employed in a public telephone exchange which has less than 500 stations."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

#### SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a conference report on the bill (S. 2697) to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a conference report upon the bill S. 2697. Is there objection?



Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman explain what this is?

Mr. STEAGALL. This conference report is entirely satisfactory to all of the conferees.

Mr. TABER. On both sides of the aisle?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. TABER. And it is approved by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes; with certain amendments which are entirely satisfactory to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2697) to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer to warehouses in or near cotton manufacturing centers in New England not to exceed 300,000 bales of cotton, to which it now has title or may hereafter acquire title, having regard for the grades and staples customarily required by manufacturers in that area: Provided, That all necessary costs in connection with such transfer will not result in additional net cost to the Corporation.

"In determining specific cotton to be exchanged under this Act, the determination shall be made by sampling and selection at the place where the cotton is stored on the date of ratification of a treaty providing for such exchange, and no cotton shall be exchanged under such treaty which, after such date, is transported to another place and there sampled and selected." And the House agree to the same.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,  
CLYDE WILLIAMS,  
BRENT SPENCE,  
JESSE P. WALCOTT,  
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

JAMES F. BYRNES,  
J. H. BANKHEAD,  
PRENTISS M. BROWN,  
JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Jr.,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 2697) to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The House amendment provided that the Commodity Credit Corporation should warehouse in or near cotton-manufacturing centers in New England such reasonable amounts of cotton held as security for loans as the Corporation deemed necessary to meet local manufacturing needs, and in no event was the amount to be less than 300,000 bales. It was also provided that the written consent of the producer or borrower to reconcentration, as provided in section 383 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act should not be required, and in determining specific cotton to be exchanged the determination was to be made by sampling and selection at the place where the cotton was stored on the date of the enactment of the act, and no cotton was to be exchanged which after such date was transported to another place and there sampled and selected.

The conference agreement provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall transfer to warehouses in or near cotton-manufacturing centers in New England not to exceed 300,000 bales of cotton, to which it has or may hereafter acquire title, having regard for the grades and staples customarily required by manufacturers in that area, provided that all necessary costs in connection with such transfer will not result in additional net cost to the Corporation. It is also provided that in determining specific cotton to be exchanged the determination shall be made by sampling and selection at the place where the cotton is stored on the date of the

ratification of a treaty providing for such exchange, and no cotton is to be exchanged under such treaty which, after such date, is transported to another place and there sampled and selected.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,  
CLYDE WILLIAMS,  
BRENT SPENCE,  
JESSE P. WALCOTT,  
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

#### POSTAL POWERBOAT SERVICE IN ALASKA

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 882, to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes, and consider the same at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 882, and consider the same. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. ROMJUE. Under the present law the Postmaster General has no authority to make any contract for carrying passengers. All he can do is to make contracts in regard to carrying the mail. The Department has had great difficulty in getting anyone to carry the mail for the money they are allowed.

I would like for the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] to explain the details of it.

Mr. DIMOND. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. In a certain part of Alaska, in that part which embraces the Alaska Peninsula and some of the Aleutian Islands, a region about 1,000 miles long, and containing six or seven or eight thousand people, there is difficulty in getting facilities for transportation for freight or passengers.

The purpose of this bill is to improve the service, so that in addition to furnishing transportation of the mail in this region, the bill will authorize the Postmaster General to require that the mail carrier also use in the service a safe and seaworthy boat of sufficient size to carry a reasonable number of passengers and some freight, in order to give adequate transportation service. The bill has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Postmaster General, and we have a unanimous report from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and it has been passed by the Senate by unanimous consent.

Mr. TABER. What will be the additional cost?

Mr. DIMOND. In my judgment, the additional cost will be about \$20,000 a year, but it may be somewhat more. I want to say to the House, however, that in the recent contracts that were made in 1938 for the carriage of mails in Alaska, we effected a very great savings on other contracts, so that the Government, even under this bill, will not pay any more money for the service generally than it has paid out before.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, contract for a period of not exceeding 4 years, without advertisement therefor, for the carriage of all classes of mail, by steamboat or other powerboat of United States registry, on the route from Seward, by points on Kenai Peninsula, Kodiak Island, Alaska Peninsula, the Aleutian Islands to Umnak Island, and points on Bristol Bay, Alaska, and vicinity, and back, by a schedule and under the conditions prescribed by the Postmaster General; the contractor to furnish and use in the service a safe and seaworthy boat of sufficient size to provide adequate space for mail, passengers, and freight, the annual cost not to exceed \$125,000, payment therefor to be made from the appropriation for powerboat service.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## KANIKSU NATIONAL FOREST

Mr. DeROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2752) to include within the Kaniksu National Forest certain lands owned or in course of acquisition by the United States, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 10, line 18, after "forests", insert "Lands received in exchange or purchased under the provisions of this act shall be open to mineral locations, mineral development, and patent, in accordance with the mining laws of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that a usual provision to put in this kind of a bill?

Mr. DeROUEN. Yes, sir. This was passed by both the Senate and the House. That amendment originated with the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT], who wishes this reservation made on all bills.

Mr. TABER. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, when the resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 7120, the lending bill, was voted on Tuesday last, I was absent from the House due to being in the hospital. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" on the adoption of the resolution.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include a radio address by Mr. R. W. Blackburn, secretary, American Farm Bureau Federation, made last evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the resolution relating to the Housing Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## PETROLEUM INVESTIGATION

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 290.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## House Resolution 290

Whereas in 1934 the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by a subcommittee thereof, under authority of House Resolution 441, Seventy-third Congress, conducted a petroleum investigation and on January 3, 1935, submitted to the House a report thereon (Rept. No. 2, 74th Cong.), which investigation and report served as the basis for the enactment of important oil legislation; and

Whereas on July 22, 1939, the President of the United States addressed a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, reading, in part, as follows: "I appreciate the thoroughness with which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted the petroleum investigation in 1934 in response to H. R. 441; but in the light of changes that have taken place, I believe the committee may wish to study developments since that time by investigation and hearings prior to the next session of the Congress. To this end, and with a view to the enactment of suitable legislation in the next session, I request that the petroleum conservation bill which I today discussed with you and Representative Cole be introduced at this session"; and

Whereas the bill referred to by the President in such letter was introduced on July 26, 1939, as H. R. 7372: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized—

(a) To conduct such investigation as may be necessary to bring up to date its study and report made pursuant to House Resolution

441, Seventy-third Congress, which provided for the investigation of (1) the production, importation, storage, transportation, refining, purchase, and sale of petroleum and its products for the purpose of determining whether there is an excessive supply of petroleum and its products; whether such excessive supply, if it exists, injuriously affects commerce in petroleum and its products and has the effect of rendering unprofitable the operation of wells of small but settled production and will cause their natural resources, induced by absence of restrictions upon the quantity which may move in commerce, results in waste and inferior uses; whether restrictions should be placed upon the quantities of petroleum and its products which may move in commerce when an excessive supply exists, and if so, whether such restrictions should regulate and coordinate commerce in petroleum and its products among the several States and with foreign nations, with fair and equitable apportionment among the States and among different operators and sources of supply; and whether commerce in petroleum and its products is of such a nature that it may be regarded as a unit for the purpose of establishing quotas irrespective of whether transactions are interstate or intrastate, or whether exportation or importation is involved; and (2) all other questions in relation to the subject of regulating commerce in petroleum and its products; and

(b) To investigate the methods and practices employed in the production and storage of petroleum from deposits within the United States, for the purpose of determining whether such methods and practices are wasteful of petroleum and the reservoir energy available for recovery thereof from such deposits; whether the employment of such methods and practices is inimical to the maintenance of reserves of petroleum, and of the facilities for the recovery and transportation thereof, available for military and supporting civilian needs in an adequate national defense; and whether the employment of such methods and practices burdens and obstructs interstate commerce and unduly limits the usefulness of instruments of transportation in, and causes the abandonment of facilities for, such commerce; and to investigate any other matters bearing upon the practicability and advisability of enacting legislation of the character of H. R. 7372, introduced on July 26, 1939; and

(c) To investigate methods and practices employed in the production, transportation, and distribution of petroleum and its products for the purpose of determining whether such methods and practices, in or in relation to interstate commerce in petroleum and its products, constitute unfair methods and practices from the standpoint of their effect upon producers and consumers.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY ACROSS CHEROKEE INDIAN RESERVATION, N. C.

Mr. DeROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6668) to grant the State of North Carolina a right-of-way for the Blue Ridge Parkway across the Cherokee Indian Reservation in North Carolina, to provide for the payment of just compensation for said right-of-way, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman explain this bill.

Mr. DeROUEN. This bill has been before the committee for several years. It provides for a right-of-way through the Cherokee Indian Reservation in North Carolina. The disagreement was that the survey which was at first proposed went through the Soco Reservation, where the agricultural lands, the best lands of the Indians, were, and we objected to that. So finally, after long hearings during several years, we recently held a hearing before the committee and an agreement was reached by which we were willing to grant this right-of-way, provided it would not go through the Soco



Valley, and provided further that a new section would be added as section 8 of the bill, which provides as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be deemed to constitute a precedent for authorizing the Secretary of the Interior or any other officer of the United States to grant or take for any purpose any other Indian lands or property within the Cherokee Indian Reservation without the consent of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians.

The chief and the assistant chief of the Cherokees testified before our committee and agreed that if this amendment were added to the bill they would have no objection to the enactment of the bill.

This bill provides that the State of North Carolina must buy and pay for all this land, and give it without any cost to the United States Government.

Mr. RICH. What are we going to do to take care of the Indian tribes?

Mr. DEROUEN. The Indian tribes are cared for under the Indian laws.

Mr. RICH. If we take this land from the Indian tribes because of the passing of this legislation, what are we going to do to reimburse the Indians, and who is going to pay it?

Mr. DEROUEN. The Indians will receive \$40,000 for this right-of-way on the ridge and not in the Soco Valley, where they have their land. Both the chief and the assistant chief stated to the committee that there was no disagreement. The only thing they were afraid of was that other roads might be built. They did not want this to happen too often, and did not want other roads going through their reservation. They realized, however, that it would mean much to them as well as to other people, and there was no disagreement between the white folks in the States and the authorities. With the adoption of this change they were perfectly satisfied. They did not want this to constitute a precedent; and secondly, they did not want the road to go through the Soco Valley, but on the ridge, way up where no one lives.

Mr. RICH. Then the Indian tribes will not come back on the Federal Government at some time in the future and expect us to make them a further payment?

Mr. DEROUEN. Not at all. The State of North Carolina pays the Indian tribes \$40,000 for the right-of-way.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, but I have no recollection of our committee's considering this bill. The subject matter of the bill would seem to bring it within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Indian Affairs. What committee did consider this bill?

Mr. DEROUEN. I will explain to the gentleman. This has to do with a right-of-way for a road.

Mr. RICH. For a parkway.

Mr. DEROUEN. For a parkway, a continuation of the Great Smokies National Parkway. It has been before the Committee on Public Lands for several years.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield further, this is a matter directly affecting an Indian reservation. I believe that before the House should be asked to pass this bill by unanimous consent, a bill dealing with a subject within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Indian Affairs, the members of that committee, at least, should have had the matter called to their attention.

Mr. DEROUEN. Let me answer it this way, as far as reference to the committee is concerned: That was done by the Parliamentarian. We have had it for about 4 years trying to arrive at a compromise. This is not the type of reservation one ordinarily thinks of when one speaks of Indian reservations.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the Indians involved in this reservation have expressed their approval of this proposed bill I shall not object.

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; they have; the chief and assistant chief living on the reservation. That is what I am trying to tell the gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of that fact, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my opposition, but I respectfully suggest that when any more Indian reservation bills are

referred to the gentleman's committee that he send them to the proper committee for consideration.

Mr. DEROUEN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and empowered, whenever he may determine that the requirements of this act have been fulfilled, to grant and convey to the State of North Carolina a right-of-way for the Blue Ridge Parkway across any lands or other property within the Cherokee Indian Reservation in North Carolina held in trust by the United States for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians. Such grant and conveyance shall pass to the State of North Carolina in fee simple absolute all right, title, and interest of the United States and the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians in and to all lands and other property situate and lying within the boundaries of said right-of-way.

SEC. 2. The location and boundaries of said right-of-way, which shall not exceed 1,000 feet in width, shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior. Before approving any plan for the location and boundaries of said right-of-way the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit a copy of the plan to the council of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and shall allow said council at least 90 days thereafter for the submission of recommendations in favor of the approval or disapproval of the plan or in support of any alterations therein which said council may desire to propose. In determining the location and boundaries of said right-of-way, the Secretary of the Interior shall give effect to the recommendations submitted to him by the council of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians to the extent that he finds such recommendations to be consistent with the interest of the public in the proper placement of the Blue Ridge Parkway for recreational and other public purposes.

SEC. 3. In consideration for the granting of said right-of-way, the State of North Carolina shall pay to the United States in trust for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians a sum sufficient to constitute just compensation to the said band and the members thereof for the taking of said right-of-way for parkway purposes. The just compensation herein referred to shall cover all elements of damage for which the Constitution of the United States would require compensation to be made in proceedings brought by the United States for the condemnation of a like right-of-way across lands in private ownership, and shall also cover any further elements of damage for which the Constitution or laws of North Carolina would require compensation to be made in proceedings brought by the State highway commission for the condemnation of a like right-of-way across lands in private ownership, without diminution in either case for any benefits resulting from the use of said right-of-way for parkway purposes. All amounts agreed upon or awarded as just compensation for said right-of-way shall bear simple interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum until paid, to be computed from the date when deed for said right-of-way is accepted by the State of North Carolina.

SEC. 4. At any time after the determination of the location and boundaries of said right-of-way the council of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians may make a contract with the State of North Carolina, liquidating the sum to be paid as just compensation for said right-of-way and prescribing the time and manner of its payment. Such contract shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior if he finds that the sum to be paid thereunder will meet the requirements of section 3 of this act and that the terms on which payment is to be made are fair and reasonable. Upon approval by the Secretary of the Interior such contract shall become binding upon the United States, the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and the State of North Carolina.

SEC. 5. At any time after the determination of the location and boundaries of said right-of-way the Secretary of the Interior may execute and deliver a deed conveying said right-of-way to the State of North Carolina: *Provided, however,* That if no contract liquidating the sum to be paid as just compensation for said right-of-way shall have been made and approved, the Secretary of the Interior, before delivering such deed, shall require the State of North Carolina to furnish a bond, in form and amount satisfactory to him, conditioned for the payment of just compensation in accordance with section 3 of this act to the United States in trust for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians. Upon the delivery of a deed for said right-of-way and the acceptance of such deed by the State, title to said right-of-way shall vest in the State of North Carolina and right to the just compensation required in section 3 of this act shall vest in the United States, in trust for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians.

SEC. 6. After the delivery and acceptance of a deed for said right-of-way, the United States and the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians shall each have the right to bring suit against the State of North Carolina for the enforcement of all obligations and rights running to or vested in either of them under this act, in the event of any controversy arising with respect to the amount to be paid as just compensation for said right-of-way or with respect to any other matters pertaining to said obligations and rights. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of North Carolina to hear and

decide any such cause in accordance with law and equity; to grant such relief therein to or against any party as may be appropriate and proper under the circumstances; and to issue all lawful process necessary for the accomplishment of the foregoing purposes. The Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians may intervene in, or be made a party to, any such suit brought by the United States, and the United States may intervene in any such suit brought by the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians but shall not be made a party involuntarily: *Provided, however,* That promptly upon the institution of any such action to which the United States is not a party the said band shall cause written notice of the pendency of the action to be served upon the United States district attorney for the Western District of North Carolina, and that upon the expiration of 60 days from the date when such notice is served the United States shall be bound by any judgment or other order thereafter entered in the proceedings the same as a party thereto. The practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceeding in any such cause shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceeding in condemnation suits brought by the United States in said district court where title has passed under a declaration of taking; and the orders or judgments rendered in any such cause shall be appealable to the same extent and in the same manner, as near as may be, as like orders or judgments rendered in condemnation suits brought by the United States in said district court where title has passed under such a declaration. Acceptance of the deed for said right-of-way by the State of North Carolina shall constitute a consent to be sued under this section.

SEC. 7. Payment for said right-of-way shall be made by the State of North Carolina to the United States in trust for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians. All funds so received shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and shall be available for expenditure for such purposes as may be designated by the council of said band and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. In order to provide acceptable lands for purchase out of such funds the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to grant to the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians the beneficial interest in any lands selected by the council of said band within the tracts in the vicinity of Ravensford, N. C., now owned by the United States and known, respectively, as the Ravensford tract, containing approximately 884 acres, and the Boundary Tree tract, containing approximately 322 acres; and the said Secretary is hereby directed to exclude from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park any lands so selected and granted: *Provided, however,* That the quarry site within the Ravensford tract shall not be granted to said band. Prior to the consummation of any such grant, payment shall be made for all lands included therein by the transfer of a sum equal to the fair market value of such lands, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, from the funds placed to the credit of said band under this section to the credit of the fund "National Park Service, donations," which transfer the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to make upon request by the council of said band approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Funds so transferred shall be available for national park and monument uses, including the acquisition of lands for inclusion in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. All lands purchased or otherwise acquired for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians with the funds received under this section shall constitute a part of the Cherokee Indian Reservation in North Carolina, shall be held by the United States in trust for said band, and shall be nontaxable and nonalienable to the same extent as other lands within said reservation.

#### With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "Interior", insert "except in the Socco Calley."

Page 8, after line 6, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to constitute a precedent for authorizing the Secretary of the Interior or any other officer of the United States to grant or take for any purpose any other Indian lands or property within the Cherokee Indian Reservation without the consent of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Maryland and Mrs. O'DAY asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### WAGE-HOUR AMENDMENTS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the fact that there was no objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the gentleman from Georgia to consider a bill amending the Wage-Hour Act exempting only rural telephone exchanges having under 500 phones makes it very obvious that the rule reported yesterday to make in order the consideration of the three bills amending the Wage and Hour Act will not be called up.

We will not have a chance to vote on the Barden bill, for which the Committee on Rules provided a rule. We had every reason to expect it would come before the House. As one who was a member of the Labor Committee and who attended the hearings on that bill and as one who made the motion to recommit the Wage-Hour Act when it passed, may I say that the will of Congress has been thwarted by the leadership by not permitting the rule to come before the House. I believe the Barden bill would have passed the House. Something more than rural telephone exchanges needs to be exempted from the law. I would not have objected when that matter came up, but not a word has been said since this action has been taken, which means that the administration is afraid to let it come to the floor. We will not have a chance to consider it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair agreed to recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], who states he has a question of personal privilege to present.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the House does not at this time seem to be inclined to consider very much legislation, especially any legislation of far-reaching importance. I have been asked, I guess, 50 times a day for the last week whether or not the so-called amendments to the wage-hour bill will be taken up for consideration during this session. The answer is, they will not.

Mr. SABATH rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized. How long does the gentleman desire?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not very long.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for "not very long."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the rule that means 1 hour, does it not?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman presents a question of personal privilege, he is entitled to 1 hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a question of personal privilege to present, a question that also involves the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, this involves the integrity of the RECORD. Under date of July 27, when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] had the floor, certain remarks were made by me under a reservation of the right to object. I send to the Speaker's desk a printed copy of the RECORD and a transcript from the Official Reporters, which shows that all of those remarks made by me were stricken from the RECORD by the gentleman from Illinois. That is the question of personal privilege and of the privilege of the House I now present, and which will be followed by a motion.



The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the gentleman presents a question affecting the privileges of the House and he is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very, very brief.

Mr. Speaker, I raise this question because this is not the only instance in which the RECORD has not accurately reported the proceedings which have taken place on the floor. The question is not raised because the remarks which were stricken from the RECORD were deemed by me to be of any particular importance, but because it does involve the right of every Member, when he so desires, to have the remarks he made on the floor recorded in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the gentleman care to apprise the Members of the language that was stricken, so that we will know what it is all about?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will. I read from the official transcript. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] had the floor and said:

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 more minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was the gentleman present in the Labor Committee this morning when John Lewis made that statement?

Mr. KELLER. Yes; I was.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you offer any objection?

Mr. KELLER. I did not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You thought it was true, did you?

Mr. KELLER. I did not ask you for that, or anybody else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but I am asking you. [Laughter.]

Now, all of those words were stricken from the RECORD, and Mr. KELLER's remarks appear as one connected statement without any interruption, without showing that anyone else took part in the colloquy. If those words had been stricken by someone on the Republican side, by some tory Democrat—if there be such a political creature—who had attempted to undermine the Constitution by destroying the right of free speech and a free press, perhaps I would not have thought much about it, because I know that the various "economic royalists" and all those who venture to question the wisdom or adaptability, whatever it may be termed, of the present program to our national problems, are to be criticized, and their remarks perhaps should be stricken from the RECORD; at least, that appears to be the view of some people. But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] is a self-styled great liberal.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. What does the gentleman call a "liberal" today?

Mr. HOFFMAN. One who is willing to decide everything for us, solve every problem, every crisis, every emergency, without a moment's consideration, give away everyone's property except his own; something along that line. [Laughter.]

When the gentleman from Illinois, who is creating that great lake over there in his State for the benefit of the carp and the people who live around it, creating it at the expense of the taxpayers of the Nation for the benefit of the voters of his district, so that the "economic royalists" can build their homes down there on its shores, after the Government fixes it up, talks so much, so loudly, and, some may think, so eloquently, about free speech, I was almost prostrated by grief when I saw in the RECORD what the gentleman had done; that he had committed, to him, the unpardonable, of depriving a fellow Member of the great constitutional right to free speech. [Laughter.] You could hear the foundations of this great Capitol of ours fairly quake; see them rock when the gentleman struck from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD those words. The words themselves were not of any importance. It is the principle that is involved that makes the question important, vital. You would not deny to a poor, humble, ignorant, unassuming, and uneducated Republican, who is not a Communist, who is not antilabor, the privilege, would you, of just putting in a few words here and there? The law,

the Constitution, is for the protection of the weak, the lowly, those who are unable to defend themselves, as I am unable, incapable of defending myself from the mighty thrust of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER]. He is strong, magnificent in his presence; his voice is music that charms us all when he takes the floor, his logic irresistible when he discourses of carp and lakes for his district, all at Government expense. So when the gentleman from Illinois, who has written books—the great author and the great statesman, as he styles himself—strikes from the RECORD those remarks, I believe the RECORD should be corrected.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. The gentleman was revising his remarks without extending them, was he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know about that. What he did was to strike from the RECORD, and that without permission, the remarks of another Member.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take any more time, because I know you are all in a hurry to get away.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move to correct the RECORD, on page 10252, by inserting after the words — in the — paragraph, the following:

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was the gentleman present in the Labor Committee this morning when John Lewis made that statement?"

"Mr. KELLER. Yes; I was.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you offer any objection?"

"Mr. KELLER. I did not.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. You thought it was true, did you?"

"Mr. KELLER. I did not ask you for that, or anybody else.

"Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but I am asking you. [Laughter.]"

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the motion may be a little vague in that it states "after the words —." The reason for this is that the official stenographer's transcript of what the gentleman from Illinois said does not indicate where this colloquy belongs, so we will have to ask the gentleman from Illinois to help.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman believe it would be a kindly act if the gentleman would hold his motion in abeyance and give the distinguished gentleman from Illinois a chance to ask unanimous consent to correct the error? I cannot believe that a great liberal would intentionally take it upon himself to censor the proceedings of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I do not believe he did it either, in the spirit of censorship; probably his only thought was to preserve for posterity the purity, the continuity, of his thought; I just think it was a slip, you know, of the shears.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It was inadvertently done, and the gentleman should have the opportunity to ask unanimous consent to correct the error.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is right, because if you will refer to the stenographer's minutes you will notice that the gentleman from Illinois just took the shears and clipped off his set speech, inserted it, added to it here, and crossed out the remarks which I made. So I have not the slightest objection; in fact, I will be happy if the gentleman from Illinois wishes to make such a request, for I really love him, admire him, and think he does much to relieve what on occasion might otherwise be a dull day.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Why does not the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois so he can ask unanimous consent to make the correction?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. KELLER. I am not asking the gentleman to do that. The gentleman has his motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Suit yourself about it, but I would be glad to have you do it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan, to correct the RECORD.

The motion was agreed to.

**SURVEY AND STUDY OF THE NATIONAL PARKS, NATIONAL MONUMENTS, AND NATIONAL SHRINES**

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 284.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

**House Resolution 284**

*Resolved, That, for the purpose of making a survey and obtaining information necessary as a basis for legislation, the Committee on the Public Lands, as a whole, or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a survey and study of the national parks, national monuments, and national shrines and of the administration of them and of the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to them. The committee shall report to the House, as soon as practicable after January 3, 1940, the result of its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems desirable.*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that to consider a resolution such as this by unanimous consent—I do not know that a report from the committee is available—is rather a broad-scale proposition. How much money will this survey cost?

Mr. DEROUEN. Not to exceed \$2,000.

Mr. RICH. When will the report come in?

Mr. DEROUEN. The report will be made during the recess of Congress, after the Congress adjourns.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, only a short while ago a volume came to my desk, and I am sure it went to every Member of the House, which apparently indicated that a survey had been made by the Department of the Interior along the same line. Is not that true?

Mr. DEROUEN. That is where the trouble lies. None of us in the committee or in the Congress knows anything about all these monuments and parks for which we have been appropriating money. It has been approximately 16 years since a survey has been made by the Congress of this subject. It seems to me it would be proper and the part of wisdom that some committee of the Congress go and see for themselves about these monuments and parks and report to the Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the matter so urgent that we cannot investigate a little further, at least until tomorrow, and see what sort of investigation the Department of the Interior has already made?

Mr. DEROUEN. The Department of the Interior has no objection to this resolution, and your minority leader is in agreement with it. We have consulted all parties concerned, and they are all in agreement that this would be a very conservative thing to do.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But they may not be aware that such an investigation has already been made and a report prepared in document form.

Mr. DEROUEN. From what I hear, there seems to be a disposition in the Congress not to accept the surveys of Mr. Ickes' Department.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I realize the Speaker will make the appointment, but who is going to make the recommendations to the Speaker? Will the members come from the Public Lands Committee or from the Committee on Appropriations that makes the appropriations for these parks?

Mr. DEROUEN. The appointments will be made by the Speaker, and he will appoint, according to the usual custom, members of the minority and the majority, and then the matter will be referred to the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. RICH. I am interested in knowing whether the members of the committee will be from the Committee on the Public Lands or not.

Mr. DEROUEN. Yes; they will be from the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there has been a survey made, and the survey

has been made available by the Department of the Interior. I wonder if the gentleman would not withdraw his request now and look at the copy of that survey that is in the possession of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and see if that does not answer his purpose before going ahead with a resolution tying us up to this expenditure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman that if there is no duplication, I would have no reason to object, but I do not believe there ought to be overlapping of work in this field.

Mr. CARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is to be the nature of this investigation?

Mr. DEROUEN. It is not to be an investigation. Let us be frank about it on both sides. I have been on the Public Lands Committee during the last 12 years, and my experience has been that whenever we bring any bills in here that have to do with monuments or parks, very few Members know anything about them. We have appropriated a lot of money for these purposes and Congress does not know anything about such matters, and it would therefore seem that \$2,000 would not be a large expenditure for the purpose of informing the Congress through a survey made by Members from both sides of the House, who will perform the work and tell the Members of the Congress what they have found. No one knows what has been done in the past, and I have no interest personally further than what I have just stated.

Mr. CARTER. Does not the gentleman know that that information is all available through the Department of the Interior, and all he has to do is to send a communication down there and get the information?

Mr. DEROUEN. I thought I knew about these matters myself; but let us be fair and frank about it. Every time I bring any of those reports from the Interior Department or from any of the bureaus, I am told that they are not correct. Now, what do I know about it? I do not know anything about it personally, and I am trying to be fair about the matter.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Why does not the gentleman write a personal letter to Mr. Ickes?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have requested that the gentleman hold this over until tomorrow. I would like to get some further information.

Mr. DEROUEN. May I call the gentleman's attention to this fact. We are about to adjourn, and unless we act on this matter now it will be too late to have it sent back to the committee and have appropriate action taken. If we adjourn and there is nothing done about this, we will be in the same position we have been in every year in the past.

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman will have time tomorrow to bring this up and for the present, Mr. Speaker, I am going to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

**POSTAL POWERBOAT SERVICE IN ALASKA**

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair will lay on the table the bill H. R. 2748, to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for certain powerboat service in Alaska, and for other purposes, a similar Senate bill having been passed.

**PETROLEUM INVESTIGATION**

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask particularly the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]. The resolution passed the House a few moments ago providing for an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and funds were provided for this investigation by the House yesterday on the second deficiency appropriation bill through the courtesy of Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia and Mr. TABER. I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 291, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:



## House Resolution 291

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by H. Res. 290, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$25,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or by any subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation, signed by the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "\$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000."

After line 11, add the following:

"Sec. 2. That the official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise engaged.

"Sec. 5. The head of each executive department is hereby requested to detail to said select committee such number of legal and expert assistants as said committee may from time to time deem necessary."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to and the resolution as amended was agreed to.

## KYLE BLAIR

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3104, for the relief of Kyle Blair, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment. I might say for the information of the House that the bill passed the House with an appropriation of \$3,500. The Senate reduced that amount to \$2,500, and the author of the bill is agreeable.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3104, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$2,500."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

## BANKS BUSINESS COLLEGE

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 777, for the relief of Banks Business College, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 777, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Banks Business College, a corporation organized in 1885 and existing under the laws of the State of New Jersey and having its principal place of business at Philadelphia, Pa., is hereby authorized to bring suit against the United States of America in the Court of Claims for the purpose of recovering any alleged damages suffered by the said Banks Business College which the Court of Claims may find to be attributable to the United States Government by reason of the said Banks Business College's being evicted on January 1, 1918, from the premises which it occupied.

"Sec. 2. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, consider, and determine such action upon its merits, with the view of rendering judgment, if any, in favor of the claimant for any such alleged damages described in section 1.

"Sec. 3. This act shall not be interpreted as raising any presumption or conclusion of fact or law but shall be held solely to provide for trial upon facts as may be alleged."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

## CLAIMANTS OF DAMAGE BY FLOOD NEAR BEAN LAKE, PLATTE COUNTY, MO.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1693) to confer jurisdiction on the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood at or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, and Sugar Lake, in Buchanan County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1693, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "That", insert "notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provisions of law to the contrary."

Page 1, line 5, after "judgment", insert "without interest, but with costs, under and in accordance with the same provisions of law as if the United States were a private party."

Page 2, after line 21, insert:

"Sec. 2. The United States district attorney for the western district of Missouri is hereby charged with the duty of defending the United States in any suit instituted under the authority of this act."

Page 2, after line 21, insert:

"Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to pay judgments under this act. Such amounts shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury when the judgment of the district court has become final and on presentation to the Secretary of a duly authenticated copy of the judgment. Such payment shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of claims arising out of such flood damage."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

## WOMEN'S BOARD OF DOMESTIC MISSIONS

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1875) for the relief of the Women's Board of Domestic Missions, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$1,500."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAYBURN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GEORGE SLADE

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2452) for the relief of George Slade, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, strike out "\$4,500" and insert "\$500, and the additional sum of \$50 per month in an amount not to exceed \$4,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## J. MILTON SWENEY

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R.

4260) for the relief of J. Milton Sweney, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$800.90."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NADINE SANDERS

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1164) for the relief of Nadine Sanders, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1164) entitled "An act for the relief of Nadine Sanders," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,  
EUGENE J. KEOGH,  
J. PARNELL THOMAS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

M. M. LOGAN,  
EDWARD R. BURKE,  
ARTHUR CAPPER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1164), for the relief of Nadine Sanders, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Committee on Claims reported favorably on H. R. 1876, for the relief of the same claimant, in the amount of \$1,500, for damages sustained on account of personal injuries received on February 13, 1937, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck in Santa Fe, N. Mex., by a Soil Conservation Service truck. S. 1164 was substituted for the House bill on the floor of the House and passed with an amendment made on the floor, and accepted, reducing the amount from \$1,096.40, as reported by the Senate, to \$750. At the conference, the amount of \$1,096.40 was agreed upon.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,  
EUGENE J. KEOGH,  
J. PARNELL THOMAS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### OKIE MAY FEGLEY

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 875) for the relief of Okie May Fegley.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 875) for the relief of Okie May Fegley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R.

875) entitled "An Act for the relief of Okie May Fegley" having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment and agree to the sum of "\$6,000" to be inserted in lieu of "\$5,000" in line 7, page 1.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,  
EUGENE J. KEOGH,  
J. PARNELL THOMAS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

H. H. SCHWARTZ,  
J. G. TOWNSEND, Jr.,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 875), for the relief of Okie May Fegley, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Committee on Claims reported the bill in the amount of \$8,500 to compensate the claimant for injuries caused by a post-office truck and the bill passed the House in this amount. The Senate passed the bill in the amount of \$5,000 in lieu of \$8,500, and at the conference the compromise amount of \$6,000 was agreed upon.

AMBROSE J. KENNEDY,  
EUGENE J. KEOGH,  
J. PARNELL THOMAS,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### BARNET WARREN

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2271) for the relief of Barnet Warren, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey.

#### FIVE YEARS OF THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### RESULTS FAVORABLE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, heretofore I have briefly set forth some of the reasons why it was necessary for this Nation to reverse the tariff policy of the previous administration in order to improve the conditions of foreign trade. I have pointed out that the method chosen for accomplishing this was a logical and forward step in taking the tariff out of log-rolling politics. Today I intend to discuss some of the results of that program.

After 5 years of the reciprocal-trade agreements program, examination of the best statistical and other evidence available, obliges one to conclude that it has been a decided success. Quite naturally the program has not satisfied everyone. Some people were afraid that that which ought to happen might happen under the program, therefore they opposed it from the very outset. Some people believe that they have well-founded grievances against certain action taken in the operation of the program. It was not expected that some of those who had part of their unwarranted and excessive tariff subsidies taken away from them would applaud such action. They were not expected to view the program from a broad national viewpoint.

There are other individuals opposed to trade agreements who believe in taking all without giving anything in return. Some say they believe in reciprocity, but when it comes to reduction of the towering trade barriers they only give lip service to the principle. They would have us gain concessions in trade without giving any in return. Then there are



certain organizations whose very existence depends upon faultfinding and criticism; that is their stock in trade. No difference how convincing the evidence, they would not admit of success. They prophesied that trade agreements would be bad for the country and they would have it so. But it can fairly be said that the Nation as a whole endorses the trade-agreements program and believes that it has been successful in its accomplishments. I believe the results of this program give some justification for rejecting the theory that nations cannot have greater economic harmony. Although no one holds that we have arrived at the millennium since the passage of the Trade Agreements Act, our foreign trade has managed to "ride out the storm in comparative security"; its condition is much better than some other phases of our economy which have not had the advantage of such a constructive and far-reaching program. There is good reason to hold that the United States at last has adopted for itself a realistic tariff and commercial policy which fits its needs. The program goes a long way in adjusting the Nation to world conditions as they actually exist.

#### MEASURING TANGIBLE RESULTS OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

What then does the record show for 5 years? In the first place, agreements with 20 countries—21 agreements, including 2 with Canada—have been negotiated. The Czechoslovak agreement has been nullified. An agreement with Venezuela is under negotiation and a supplemental agreement is also being negotiated with Cuba. Exploratory conversations are going on with several countries and some other of the present agreements may soon be reopened for revision. All nations are invited to align themselves with this program of trade betterment. It is not an exclusive program for countries of a particular political ideology. It is comprehensive enough to include all forms of government.

The trade with the countries with which agreements have been concluded represents almost 60 percent of our total foreign commerce. This means that within the framework of the principles of fairness and soundness of the trade agreements the countries with which we carry on more than half of our foreign commerce apparently believe that a reversal of the trend of recent years is necessary, and have accepted our leadership; they have, by their acts, expressed a willingness to cooperate in liberalizing foreign trade. In addition to Canada, our good neighbor to the north and our second largest market, the list of countries includes Great Britain, our largest single market, France, Cuba, the Netherlands, and Brazil, other large markets and important suppliers of raw materials needed in the United States.

Our total trade embraced with these countries amounted in 1937 to over \$2,000,000,000. About 68 percent of this trade has been covered by concessions granted and received, including bindings of present rates of duty and binding items on the free list. These guaranties are of considerable importance in stabilizing commerce which is greatly needed at the present juncture of world events. United States exports have almost doubled since 1932 and 1933, the low years preceding the Trade Agreements Act. It is quite possible that much of this trade would have been regained without any reciprocity program. No one, so far as I know, attributes all this gain in trade to the agreements alone. Many other factors have entered into the picture. Nevertheless, a comparison of exports on a broad 2-year basis, 1934 and 1935, with the last 2 years of trade agreements, 1937 and 1938, shows an increase to agreement countries of about 61 percent; exports to nonagreement countries for the same comparative periods increased by about 38 percent. It has been suggested by opponents of trade agreements that the gains in exports have largely been in war materials. It may be true that considerable quantities of materials which can be used in war have been exported, but this is in no way a result of the trade-agreements program. No two people seem to agree on what constitutes war materials, and in final analysis practically everything which is exported may be utilized during a conflict. Tabulations have been placed in the Record, including petroleum products, trucks, and other articles of peaceful commerce as war materials. In any case,

we would have had sales of war materials quite apart from trade agreements. No special efforts are made to gain concessions abroad for our war materials, as some would have us believe.

I submit as part of my remarks a table from the Department of Commerce showing the summary of trade gains under the trade agreements by agreement and nonagreement countries:

*United States foreign trade with trade-agreement countries and with all others in 1937 and 1938 compared with 1934 and 1935*

[Millions of dollars]

Item	Comparison of 1937-38 with 1934-35			
	Average value		Change	
	1934 and 1935	1937 and 1938	Value	Per cent
United States exports, including reexports:				
Total, all trade-agreement countries <sup>1</sup> .....	759.8	1,224.8	+465.0	+61.2
Total, all nonagreement countries.....	1,448.0	1,996.8	+548.8	+37.9
Total, all countries.....	2,207.8	3,221.6	+1,013.8	+45.9
United States general imports:				
Total, all trade-agreement countries <sup>1</sup> .....	793.9	1,073.6	+279.7	+35.2
Total, all nonagreement countries.....	1,057.4	1,448.5	+391.1	+37.0
Total, all countries.....	1,851.3	2,522.1	+670.8	+36.2

<sup>1</sup> Including the 17 countries (and colonies) with which agreements were in operation during the greater part of the last 12 months. Only 1 of the agreements was in operation throughout 1935, 6 throughout 1936, 12 by the middle of 1936, 15 by the middle of 1937, and 18 by the end of 1938. The agreement with Ecuador only came into force on Oct. 23, 1938, and is therefore not yet included in the above calculations as an agreement country. The new agreement with Canada, and the agreement with the United Kingdom (including Newfoundland and non-self-governing British colonies) which became effective Jan. 1, 1939, brought the number of agreement countries up to 19; an agreement with Turkey went into effect on May 5, 1939, making 20 countries.

Source: Records of Division of Foreign Trade Statistics, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Exports represent only one side of a two-way street. Both sides must be open if the street is going to carry anything like a maximum of traffic. So it is with trade; it must move in both directions. Some groups, from a purely selfish viewpoint, would like to have exports without imports. We cannot have, and we may as well reconcile ourselves to the fact, exports without imports. It takes trade in both directions to make healthful commerce. It cannot be repeated too often that we must receive goods and services if we are to send them out.

From the point of view of relative gains in trade, with agreement and nonagreement countries, the import picture is less favorable than that for the exports—that is, the imports from nonagreement countries have increased more than have imports from agreement countries. In a similar broad comparison of a 2-year preagreement and postagreement periods, 1934 and 1935 compared with 1937 and 1938, imports from agreement countries increased by about 35 percent, while imports from nonagreement countries increased by 37 percent. This greater increase of imports from nonagreement countries was largely accounted for by raw materials principally from nonagreement countries. Products such as corn, as well as other agricultural products brought in because of the drought of 1936, happened to have come from nonagreement countries. This smaller increase in imports from nonagreement countries certainly justifies the conclusion that trade agreements have not ruined domestic industries by increasing imports.

If excessive barriers had been lowered, but no increase had been shown in trade we might assume that the removal of trade impediments prevented our foreign commerce from falling still lower. In some instances, a well-deserved victory may be won by merely holding the present position. A mere stabilizing of trade against the return to the desperate conditions of 1932 and 1933 might be considered a substantial measure of success.

The figures which I have just quoted as stated came from the Department of Commerce. I find that an independent study of the results of trade agreements appeared in the summer issue of the Harvard Business Review (p. 486). (Is the United States Losing Its Foreign Trade? Charles

A. Bliss, assistant professor of business statistics, Harvard University.)

Opponents of trade agreements cannot say that this analysis is Government propaganda. As a matter of fact, the article was generally unfavorable to the program. I quote the following:

The United States without question has gained an increasing share in the imports of agreement countries since the signing of trade treaties. This observation holds true even when Canada and France, the two largest countries in the agreement group, are excluded from the comparison.

The evidence on exports to the United States is not so clear. It suggests, however, that our importance as a customer has not increased parallel to our importance as a seller.

In other words, export trade has increased more with agreement than with nonagreement countries and imports were down in relation to exports, especially during 1938. With such unbiased evidence, it seems a little farfetched for opponents of trade agreements to maintain that we have lost out in bargaining for trade and that other countries have "gotten the best of us." Viewed in the light of our creditor position, it would seem that we have succeeded almost too well, particularly when it is recalled that our exports in 1938 exceeded imports by more than a billion dollars.

#### UNITED STATES GAINS IN RELATIVE POSITION IN TRADE WITH WORLD

The following figures from the above-quoted article of the Harvard Business Review seem significant:

	American exports as share of world exports	American imports as share of world imports
1934.....	11.3	9.0
1935.....	12.0	11.8
1936.....	12.2	12.8
1937.....	13.5	13.3
1938.....	14.0	10.0

From these figures it is seen that from 1934 to 1938 we improved our position by increasing our exports from about 11 to 14 percent of world exports while imports in 1934 were 9 percent of world total, and, after reaching about 13 percent in 1937, fell back to only 10 percent of the world total in 1938. The preliminary figures of foreign trade for the first 5 months of 1939 show a tendency for the import-export situation to more nearly equalize.

Not only has the trade of the United States been improved absolutely with agreement countries, but also relatively in relation to trade with some other countries. For example, Netherlands imports from the United States increased by 71 percent in 1937 over 1935, while the total increase in Netherlands imports from all countries was only 35 percent. Belgian imports from the United States increased more than 70 percent in 1937 over 1934, while total Belgian imports increased by only 44 percent. Swiss imports from the United States increased in 1937 over 1935 by 28 percent, while total Swiss imports from all countries increased only 1 percent.

#### EFFECTS OF AGREEMENTS ON AGRICULTURE

There has been a great deal said about the effects of the program in its relationship to agriculture. Many statistics have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in an attempt to show that trade agreements have operated in such a way as to injure agriculture. Some opponents have been so brash as to suggest that, for some reason or other, those sponsoring the program desire to aid industry to the detriment of agriculture. Of course, any such suggestion is pure imagination.

One method which has been used, in an attempt to mislead farmers, is to show a long list of imports of agricultural products for the depression years in comparison with the relative prosperous years of 1936 and 1937. In most instances there have been increases over the extreme depression low. In presenting the list there is always the implica-

tion, if not direct statement, that the increased imports are the results of trade agreements. In these tables wheat and corn have been shown, the importations of which largely resulted from the drought of 1934 and 1936; these lists include wool, hides and skins, and flaxseed, and other products which have always been imported because we do not produce enough for our own use. None of these items have been subject to a reduction in the general rates of duty in trade agreements.

Now some guarded reductions in duty on agricultural products, such as cattle, cheese, and cream, have been made. Opponents would make a much better case against the agreements if they limited their statistics and statements to those items which have been included; they realize that they are hard-pressed for a case and overstep themselves by padding their lists. Happily, farmers are becoming aware of these tactics of misrepresentation; they are gradually getting the truth of the matter.

Lists of increased imports of certain agricultural products for a few months of 1939 over 1938 have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the present session of Congress with the same misleading implications that the increases resulted from trade agreements. Some of these imports, such as wool and hides and skins, have increased because our economic condition is happily improving over last year and industry is utilizing more raw materials. The duties on these imports have not been reduced; the increased imports are a sign of the business upturn.

Since the trade agreement with Canada went in effect in 1936 there has been a desultory attack by some of the dairy groups because of small imports of dairy products. We have heard criticism because of the reduction in duty on cream. This well illustrates how unwarranted the attack has been against the program. For the first 6 months of 1939 exactly 567 gallons which was 0.04 percent of the annual quota set for imports of cream entered the United States under the reduced duty. Although the rates of duty were lowered the imports of cheese under that trade agreement have never approached the predepression level. As a matter of fact, imports of 1938 were only slightly above those for the emergency period of 1932 and 1933.

The following excerpt from an editorial of the Times, Fairmont, W. Va., illustrates the nature of the attack against the program and gives a substantial answer to the charges:

There is persistent reactionary Republican propaganda to the effect that the trade agreements have "directly resulted in an increasing flood of foreign pork into the United States." This assertion has been made frequently in the past 2 months on postcards broadcast by G. O. P. organizations and their aid societies.

Instead of the trade-agreements program having increased the imports of pork, as the Republicans claim, the figures show that the imports for the year 1934, the year in which the reciprocal trade agreements program was enacted by Congress, exceeded the imports for 1938 by more than half a million pounds.

The best over-all information available does not indicate that agriculture has come out on the short end of this program. The Department of Agriculture has found that the farm exports to the 16 countries with which agreements were in effect during the fiscal year 1937 and 1938 in comparison with the fiscal year 1935 and 1936 increased by \$102,000,000 or 55 percent, while to nonagreement countries the increase was \$20,000,000 or only 3 percent. For the same years of comparison, imports of agricultural products from agreement countries show a minus 3 percent, while imports of such products from nonagreement countries show a plus of 4 percent. The importation of agricultural products shows a result that is somewhat surprising in view of some of the criticisms which have been made in connection with the agreements. I realize that these figures represent an over-all average and that there is a certain weakness in the use of such averages, but these are not mere accidental relationships. I also realize that on a few items such as cattle, an increase in imports over the preagreement period is shown. This has occurred for a number of reasons other than lower rates of duty. This increase in imports of cattle does not necessarily mean that the cattle industry, however, has been seriously injured by the agreement with Canada. The limitation in imports at the reduced



duty through the quota, guarantees the domestic producers about 97 or 98 percent of the domestic market.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has taken the floor of the House on frequent occasions to point out the low levels of exports of cotton; he alleges that this condition is a result of trade agreements. From his expressed interest one might believe that many of his constituents are cotton producers and he is espousing their cause in Congress. One way to aid the cotton farmers is to assist them in obtaining lower tariffs and consequently lower prices on the manufactured products which they purchase and which are effectively protected by the tariff.

To anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of conditions in the world trade in cotton it must be apparent that the principal cotton-using countries of the world depend heavily upon the United States for their supplies of raw cotton, and under such conditions are not likely to establish, and have not established, tariff or other barrier against imports of American cotton. It is not tariff barriers that have checked our exports of cotton, but the systems of blocked exchanges, the shortage of American dollars, and the disparity in prices between American and foreign growths of cotton. To expect trade agreements to lower tariff barriers against American cotton when there were no such barriers is asking a good deal.

On the other hand, the trade-agreements program has helped foreign customers to obtain American dollars with which to buy American cotton, it throws its influence against the tangle of currency and exchange restrictions and it has very definitely—especially in the case of the United Kingdom, which is one of the largest foreign customers for cotton—obtained guaranties against future discrimination or barriers to imports of American cotton. Other agreements make a similar guaranty. To assert that the trade-agreements program has been a factor in the decline of the United States foreign market for cotton is to ignore and deny the main facts in the case.

Entirely eliminating cotton from the gains and losses between 1935-36 and 1937-38 we have an increase of \$106,000,000, or 108 percent, in gains of agricultural exports to agreement countries, and a gain of \$103,000,000, or 58 percent, to nonagreement countries. Of the \$106,000,000 increase in exports of foreign products, excepting cotton, to 16 trade-agreement countries during the period under consideration, the largest part was in our exports to Canada. Practically all of this increase occurred in items upon which Canadian duties were reduced by the trade agreement with that country. Furthermore, the expansion in quantity of exports to Canada of some of the leading commodities on which Canadian duty reductions were granted, was proportionately greater than the expansion of our exports of those same commodities to the rest of the world. These facts seem significant because Canada's economy closely parallels our own. The second largest part of the \$106,000,000 increase occurred in the exports of farm products, other than cotton, to the Netherlands, which rose by \$28,000,000, or by 224 percent. An examination also shows that the increase took place in items upon which the Netherlands duties were reduced by the terms of the trade agreement. Further, the third largest increase occurred in exports to Belgium, which rose by \$19,000,000, or an increase of 208 percent. These are some examples of the increases in agricultural products to agreement countries which gave us important concessions.

It is readily understood why some trade-agreement countries do not show equally favorable results with respect to agricultural products; several agreement countries themselves are primarily agricultural. Superficially unfavorable situations with respect to individual countries and specific items of trade can and have been found by critics of the program, who are primarily interested in discounting the wholesome effects of increased trade on our economy. I have alluded to some of them.

Literally hundreds of concessions for our agricultural products have been obtained from foreign countries. The list is too long to attempt to enumerate. Those who wish these

details are referred to the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on March 1939, in connection with the proposed oil and fats taxes. A mere listing of these items covers 12 pages in the printed hearings. Now it is realized that not every one of these concessions has worked out 100 percent as was hoped and expected. But many concessions, such as the increased pork quota and removal of duty from lard by the agreement with Great Britain, are of tremendous importance to agriculture.

#### TRADE AGREEMENTS NOT ENDANGERED BY BILATERALISM

In view of the recent treaty for exchange of agricultural products for critical war materials with the United Kingdom, it has been suggested that the trade-agreements program has "washed-up" and that we are forced to follow the methods of the dictators in order to dispose of our surpluses. To my mind, that is a hasty and not a well-considered conclusion. In the first place, the proposed exchange of cotton for rubber relates to only two products; the arrangement was entered into as an emergency means of reducing surplus cotton and laying up war stores; the matter of forcing blocked exchange, as is the usual practice in barter deals, is not involved in the arrangement with the United Kingdom.

There have been some suggestions that countries trading on the narrow barter or compensation method have gained a greater proportion of trade than the United States; that we cannot cope with their methods. A recent release from the Department of Commerce shows that imports from the United States into 16 countries with which reciprocal-trade agreements were in effect prior to 1938 expanded on an average of approximately 40 percent in value in the years 1936, 1937, and 1938 over the 2 years, 1934 and 1935, while imports into those same countries from Germany increased by an average of about 2 percent in value. In terms of dollars, the release shows that the average annual gain in imports from the United States was approximately \$297,746,000, while that of Germany was only \$12,244,000. After all necessary qualifications in the listing of countries, I believe those figures are significant. The advantage to the United States may be even more pronounced than revealed by statistical results when account is taken of the heavy export subsidies paid by Germany on many commodities. The system of exchange of goods for goods or barter, clearing, compensating, or other similar trade programs upon first trial seem attractive to other countries, but this method of trading in reality limits the expansion of international commerce. One of the main difficulties to be encountered by countries embracing barter agreements is the creation of large blocked balances which can be liquidated only by the purchase of products in the particular country. American concerns at the present time which have done some bartering on their own are having trouble in liquidating their balances in Germany. It has been necessary for some countries to accept inferior merchandise at higher than competitive prices in order to liquidate their balances arising through barter arrangements. This system of trade may also lead to economic domination of smaller countries by the larger trading nations.

To follow that system is to follow a system of further regimentation. The trade-agreements program is the very antithesis of regimentation. It is based upon the fundamental proposition that trade flows more freely with less restrictions. Barter arrangements and bilateral balancing agreements are negotiated under the conditional most-favored-nation principle. This system has been proposed for the United States. It seems rather odd that those who have opposed further regimentation for the United States oppose trade agreements and favor a policy which would regiment our foreign commerce to the nth degree.

#### REPUBLICANS SUPPORT UNREGIMENTED TRADE

I find that numerous Republican papers and leaders understand the difference between freeing trade and regimenting it. Those in favor of less regimentation support the trade-agreements program. In a recent editorial the Toledo Blade (June 19) commented on Secretary Hull's invitation

to the dictator countries to join in his program of unregimenting trade and stated:

If Chancellor Hitler reacts in character, he will spurn Secretary Hull's invitation. However, the world has not forgotten Hitler's recent speech in which he asserted Germany must export or die. The food-ration cards give indisputable evidence of the failure of the Nazi plan of enforced economic self-sufficiency.

Trick currency schemes and subsidies on exports by the Reich do not have much guarantee of permanency. Meantime, the dictators are quick to complain that they are cut off from raw materials. The American reciprocal-trade plan shuts off no nation from any supplies if that country is willing to enter into the plan.

Those in the United States who have been skeptical about the merits of the Hull plan may do well to take a look at the figures.

These figures have arguments which will force attention even in autocracies walled in by propaganda.

While on the question of Republican support, I want to point out that several of my colleagues, Congressmen RANKIN, COFFEE of Washington, and KITCHENS have indicated several of these endorsements in their remarks on trade agreements during the present session of Congress. I do not wish to further burden the RECORD with these expressions and intend to mention only one or two.

The following excerpts from the Journal-Times of Racine, Wis.—June 23—is typical of the expressions of Republican papers favoring trade agreements:

These trade pacts have been successful. The countries involved—ours, as much as theirs—have experienced mutual benefits and are willing to go further along the same line by lowering a few more of the barriers blocking trade.

Last year, according to the Department of Commerce, we exported 9 percent of our production of movable goods of all sorts. It was the best year since 1930. That may sound like a small market to be concerned about, but it makes the difference between profit and loss for many industries. If the 9 percent can be increased and varied even a little, it will mean benefit to more industries and to the whole country.

The trade pacts are based on the recognition that we must sell abroad if we are to keep up our own standard of living and keep our own production thriving, and also that we cannot keep on selling unless we buy more goods or raw materials from foreign countries.

#### INTANGIBLE RESULTS OF THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

There are more or less intangible but important results of the program which cannot be statistically measured. Under this program, policies of retaliation and ill will toward American products have been replaced by policies of good will and commercial cooperation in many parts of the world. The United States, I believe, is today exerting a profound influence in the direction of trade liberalization which is somewhat in keeping with our responsibility. Costly discriminations against American products have been eliminated, and guaranties have been secured against future discrimination not only in the countries with which agreements have been concluded but in countries which are not now in the orbit of these agreements. Through the most-favored-nation principle these countries have modified their treatment of our commerce. It would seem evident that the effect of the broad American program must be world-wide and profound in its implications. In the words of Secretary Hull:

The program \* \* \* offers the only practical alternative to a drift toward the anarchy of economic warfare, with all its disastrous consequences for the peace and progress of man. Its workability has been demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt. It can be embraced by all nations alike, without exception, and to the benefit of each and all.

As a matter of fact, it might be said that this program holds out the olive branch to all countries which care to engage in fair trade, carried on in accordance with the golden rule of commerce.

An important intangible result of the trade-agreements program is the favorable attention it has received throughout the world. The several conferences among the American countries have generally endorsed the economic principles of the present Secretary of State. The basic principles of the program are being put into operation by countries that have not yet negotiated agreements with the United States.

The International Chamber of Commerce, representing business organizations of many countries, has expressed the

desire to follow the leadership of the United States in its efforts to mitigate existing trade barriers. This organization strongly advocates trade agreements with strict observance of unconditional most-favored-nation policy.

It is interesting to note that in his annual report as reported by the New York Times, former Governor Winant, of New Hampshire, Director of the International Labor Office and an outstanding American citizen who has favored the Hull policy, stated:

Economic isolation is not the solution of the problems presented by the unequal distribution of natural resources and by needs for markets unless the workers are prepared to work longer hours, eat less and a lower quality of food, and live in poorer dwellings.

The Economic Intelligence Section of the League of Nations, which incidentally is still performing an important function as a clearing house for information and making important studies relative to economic matters, has endorsed the program and calls attention to the gains in trade derived from its operation.

#### TRADE AGREEMENTS A PEACE EFFORT

There has been some criticism because sponsors of the present program have maintained that it is related to peace. It has been suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and others that the peace talk has been brought in order to gain public support of this broad program. It is not a mere coincidence that practically all of the peace organizations of the United States endorse this phase of our foreign policy. The real basis for this program, as it relates to peace, may be found in a speech of the present Secretary of State made in this House more than 20 years ago—February 1919. If one fairly examines the basic principles of this program, the connection is not at all farfetched. Removing the causes of conflict, the basic principle of trade agreements would seem to be a fundamental to world peace. The dangers of the present regime of world trade arise out of systems of special privileges and arbitrary favors. Special bargaining arrangements, arbitrary allotments of quotas, unnatural diversion of trade allotments or markets to special customers all constitute fertile soil for international conflict. The equality of treatment principle tends to remove the preferential trading which is a prime cause of dissatisfaction and conflict between nations. Gen. Hugh Johnson, who is an outstanding critic of the present administration, said of the foreign policy of the United States, November 1938:

It is based on a recognition that a sound trade structure must be restored to the world to appease the handicaps imposed upon less favored nations by the vicious instruments of economic war. This is fundamental. There are few military wars in history that cannot be traced to some economic cause. The World War did not cease at the armistice. It merely changed its form from military war to economic war through the imposition of impossible reparations and the scramble toward economic self-sufficiency by tariffs, quotas, subsidies, currency manipulation, and dumping. Mr. Hull's patient effort to restore economic peace is a necessary prelude to political peace in the world. That is point No. 1 in the foreign policy of the United States, its very foundation.

The unfortunate case of Czechoslovakia has been alluded to by our critics as an example of what a trade agreement permits or does not do. It is said that we had a trade agreement with Czechoslovakia, but that it did not save that country. The point would not be worth answering if it had not been uttered by a leader of the opposition. This, of course, is a short-sighted and superficial position to take regarding the peace angle of trade agreements. Naturally a mere trade agreement with one country, when the people of a third country need markets and has a starving population, will not prevent a march to war if the necessities cannot be obtained by peaceful commerce; when nations, with teeming populations can no longer get access to markets peaceably they will attempt to take them by force; human beings are not willing to starve nor see their offspring suffer from want if they think they can obtain food by conquest or forced trading. With the world divided up into tight tariff compartments we can expect little but freebooting tactics such as have been practiced on Manchuria, Ethiopia, and Czechoslovakia. A statesmanlike trade-agreements program inaugurated 20 years ago might have prevented some of the recent conquests of markets and



raw materials. But the world has for at least two decades gone in the wrong direction.

Thomas W. Lamont has endorsed the trade-agreements program as a peace measure in the following language:

As a lifelong Republican I am strongly for the work the present Secretary of State has done. His are distinct and helpful steps in building up the trade which is necessary to peace. We must make sacrifices. We must welcome lower tariffs, so in that way the standard of living will rise and the threat of war will be lessened.

In spite of the various interpretations placed upon the words of the great Republican President McKinley regarding the particular kind of reciprocity treaties or agreements he advocated, I believe he must have had the peace angle in mind when he said:

Commercial wars are unprofitable; reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

#### COMPACTS OR AGREEMENTS AMONG STATES ON THE ATLANTIC OCEAN

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 139) to authorize compacts or agreements between or among the States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean with respect to fishing in the territorial waters and the bays and inlets of the Atlantic Ocean on which such States border, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state just what is proposed by this bill?

Mr. BLAND. When an identical bill was on the Consent Calendar yesterday Mr. Wolcott asked that it be passed over. He has since withdrawn his objection.

All that is proposed is consent to the States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean, for any two or more States to enter into compacts with respect to the fisheries, and particularly dealing with migratory fish, and if they cannot agree upon compacts they have to come back to the Congress for ratification.

Mr. MAPES. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the consent of Congress is hereby given to any two or more of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida to enter into compacts or agreements not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the uniform, common, or mutual regulation of fishing or of any species of fish, mollusks, or crustacea in the territorial waters and bays and inlets of the Atlantic Ocean on which such States border or to which their jurisdiction otherwise extends and of and anadromous fish spawning in the inland waters of those States.

SEC. 2. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to States other than those specified but which have jurisdiction over inland waters frequented by anadromous fish of the sea to enter into compacts or agreements authorized by this act.

SEC. 3. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any of the aforementioned States to establish such agencies or authorities, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective compacts or agreements herein authorized.

SEC. 4. Any compact or agreement herein authorized shall become binding or obligatory only upon those signatory States whose legislatures shall have approved such compact or agreement.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] criticized the Rules Committee for not bringing in a rule on the wage and hour bill.

I want to say to him and to the House that the Rules Committee brought in every rule that a regular legislative committee of this House asked for. I regret very much that the last two rules which the committee brought before the

House for consideration, the lending bill and the housing bill, were defeated. That was very important and beneficial legislation, but it got nowhere. And I noted that the gentleman from Kansas voted against both of those bills.

Now, the gentleman from Kansas shows a deep interest in the wage and hour bill, which contemplates the destruction of benefits voted the American wage earner during the past session. Bear in mind that the Labor Committee never asked for a rule on this bill. In my opinion the Rules Committee was exceeding its authority in granting a rule, and although I was bound as chairman of the committee to accept the majority vote to grant a rule, because I feel that such action is against all precedents and rules of the House, I have refused to call same up. If anyone is to be criticized for such action it is me, and not the leaders of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks the Chair should recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that I did not criticize the Rules Committee. I said that the Rules Committee had reported the three proposed bills and that the House had every reason to believe that they would come up before we adjourned, but that the leadership of this House was denying the House the chance in this session of Congress to vote on any amendments aside from this one exempting the rural telephone exchanges; that the House, if it had a chance would pass the Barden amendments. I did not say the Rules Committee had not reported the rule.

Mr. SABATH. Did not the gentleman vote against both rules brought in by the Committee on Rules which would have meant a great deal to agriculture, one, day before yesterday, and one today?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes. Neither the spending nor the housing bill means anything to agriculture—only a drain. What it needs is rain.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have had many requests through the mail for extracts from the writings of ex-Senator John James Ingalls. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a eulogy on Ben Hill, of Georgia, paragraphs from Blue Grass and the sonnet Opportunity, and to insert them at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the object of this brief sketch is to again call the attention of the Congress and the public to the superlative literary productions of Hon. John James Ingalls, former United States Senator from Kansas, who a half century ago was the most colorful figure in the public life of the Capital and the most eloquent orator of his time as well as a great poet and essayist. I can give only very brief quotations from his most noted productions—one from his eulogies, one from his essays, and one from his poetry.

Upon the death of Senator B. H. Hill, of Georgia, in 1883, Senator Ingalls delivered one of his greatest eulogies, from which I quote:

Ben Hill has gone to the undiscovered country.

Whether his journey thither was but one step across an imperceptible frontier, or whether an interminable ocean, black, unfluctuating, and voiceless, stretches between these earthly coasts and those invisible shores, we do not know.

Whether on that August morning after death he saw a more glorious sun rise with unimaginable splendor above a celestial horizon, or whether his apathetic and unconscious ashes still sleep in cold obstruction and insensible oblivion, we do not know.

Whether his strong and subtle energies found instant exercise in another forum, whether his dextrous and disciplined faculties are now contending in a higher Senate than ours for supremacy, or whether his powers were dissipated and dispersed with his parting breath, we do not know.

Whether his passions, ambitions, and affections still sway, attract, and impel; whether he yet remembers us as we remember him, we do not know.

These are the unsolved, the insoluble problems of mortal life and human destiny which prompted the troubled patriarch to ask that momentous question for which the centuries have given no answer: "If a man die, shall he live again?"

Every man is the center of a circle whose fatal circumference he cannot pass. Within its narrow confines he is potential, beyond it he perishes, and if immortality be a splendid but delusive dream, if the incompleteness of every career, even the longest and most fortunate, be not supplemented and perfected after its termination here, then he who dreads to die should fear to live, for life is a tragedy more desolate and inexplicable than death.

Of all the dead whose obsequies we have paused to solemnize in this Chamber I recall no one whose untimely fate seems so lamentable, and yet so rich in prophecy of eternal life, as that of Senator Hill. He had reached the meridian of his years. He stood upon the high plateau of middle life, in that serene atmosphere where temptation no longer assails, where the clamorous passions no more distract, and where the conditions are most favorable for noble and enduring achievements. \* \* \*

He was competitive and unpeaceful. He was born a polemic and controversialist, intellectually pugnacious and combative, so that he was impelled to defend any position that might be assailed or to attack any position that might be entrenched, not because the defense or the assault were essential, but because the positions were maintained and that those who held them became by that fact alone his adversaries. This tendency of his nature made his orbit erratic. He was meteoric rather than planetary, and flashed with irregular splendor rather than shone with steady and penetrating rays. His advocacy of any cause was fearless to the verge of temerity. He appeared to be indifferent to applause or censure for its own sake. He accepted intrepidly any conclusions that he reached, without inquiring whether they were polite or expedient.

\* \* \* His oratory was impetuous and devoid of artifice. He was not a posturer nor phrase monger. He was too intense, too earnest, to employ the cheap and paltry decorations of discourse. He never reconnoitered a hostile position nor approached it by stealthy parallels. He could not lay siege to an enemy, nor beleaguer him, nor open trenches, and sap and mine. His method was the charge and the onset. He was the Murat of senatorial debate. \* \* \*

But in the maturity of his powers and his fame, with unmeasured opportunities for achievement apparently before him, with great designs unaccomplished, surrounded by the proud and affectionate solicitude of a great constituency, the pallid messenger with the inverted torch beckoned him to depart. There are few scenes in history more tragic than that protracted combat with death. No man had greater inducements to live. But in the long struggle against inexorable advances of an insidious and mortal malady he did not falter nor repine. He retreated with the aspect of a victor; and though he succumbed, he seemed to conquer. His sun went down at noon, but it sank amid the prophetic splendors of an eternal dawn.

With more than a hero's courage, with more than a martyr's fortitude, he waited the approach of the inevitable hour, and went to the undiscovered country.

Ingalls has received the admiration of the English-speaking world for at least three of his superlative compositions: The inimitable prose poem, *Blue Grass*; his unsurpassed eulogies; and his incomparable sonnet, *Opportunity*. Upon the rugged granite boulder which marks his last resting place is a bronze plaque bearing this epitaph, a part of a sentence from his masterpiece of prose, *Blue Grass*:

When the fitful fever is ended, and the foolish wrangle of the market and forum is closed, grass heals over the scar which our descent into the bosom of the earth has made, and the carpet of the infant becomes the blanket of the dead.

In the limit of this brief and faltering sketch I have time only for one paragraph of *Blue Grass*, the gem-like, polished beauty of which gives a hint of its character:

Grass is the forgiveness of Nature—her constant benediction. Fields trampled with battle, saturated with blood, torn with the ruts of the cannon, grow green again with grass, and carnage is forgotten. Streets abandoned by traffic become grass-grown like rural lanes, and are obliterated. Forests decay, harvests perish, flowers vanish, but grass is immortal. Beleaguered by the sullen hosts of winter, it withdraws into the impregnable fortress of its subterranean vitality, and emerges upon the first solicitation of

spring. Sown by the winds, by wandering birds, propagated by the subtle horticulture of the elements which are its ministers and servants, it softens the rude outline of the world. Its tenacious fibers hold the earth in its place, and prevent its soluble components from washing into the wasting sea. It invades the solitude of deserts, climbs the inaccessible slopes and forbidding pinnacles of mountains, modifies climates, and determines the history, character, and destiny of nations. Unobtrusive and patient, it has immortal vigor and aggression. Banished from the thoroughfare and the field, it abides its time to return, and when vigilance is relaxed, or the dynasty has perished, it silently resumes the throne from which it has been expelled, but which it never abdicates. It bears no blazonry of bloom to charm the senses with fragrance or splendor, but its homely hue is more enchanting than the lily or the rose. It yields no fruit in earth or air, and yet should its harvest fail for a single year, famine would depopulate the world.

Shakespeare did everything better than anyone else—Shakespeare, who opened wide the portals of the human mind and soul and invited all the earth for guest; Shakespeare, who whispered into the vocabularies of the world the sweetest words that ever filtered through the hearts of men. Shakespeare did everything else better than anyone else, until Ingalls wrote *Opportunity*. *Opportunity* is the master sonnet of the English tongue. In poetry the sonnet is probably the most mechanical and artificial form of verse, consisting always of just 14 lines, a sort of automatic poem. It is the easiest kind of poem to write, and therefore it is most difficult to write a superior one. There are only a few worth remembering. Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, and Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote some good ones, but a better judge of literature than myself said that when he looked for one superior to Ingalls' *Opportunity* he looked in vain. On the walls of my office in Washington I have a facsimile in his own handwriting.

Critics have nagged at this poem as sinister in its gesture to fatalism, and many have attempted to answer *Opportunity* with another sonnet declaring that every morning opportunity knocks; but their music fades in the splendor of Ingalls' orchestration, for, say what you will of the philosophy of Ingalls' sonnet, the stately march of its majestic music sets all the orchestras of the soul to singing.

#### OPPORTUNITY

Master of human destinies am I!  
Fame, love, and fortune on my footsteps wait.  
Cities and fields I walk; I penetrate  
Deserts and seas remote, and passing by  
Hovel and mart and palace—soon or late  
I knock unbidden once at every gate!  
If sleeping, wake—if feasting, rise before  
I turn away. It is the hour of fate,  
And they who follow me reach every state  
Mortals desire, and conquer every foe  
Save death; but those who doubt or hesitate,  
Condemned to failure, penury, and woe,  
Seek me in vain and uselessly implore.  
I answer not, and I return no more.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 152, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber on official business. Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CITY OF PIERRE, S. DAK.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6446) amending section 4 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to construct, equip, maintain, and operate on Farm Island, S. Dak., certain amusement and recreational facilities; to charge for the use thereof; and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the bill been reported?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; the bill has been reported. It was called on the Consent Calendar last Monday and objected to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE]. I have



since gone over the bill with the gentleman from Indiana and he has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman explain the bill briefly?

Mr. MUNDT. This bill simply corrects legislation passed in the last session setting up a game refuge in the Missouri River. That legislation was inadvertently drawn so stringently that it prevented the game wardens from controlling predatory animals. This bill corrects that situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to construct, equip, maintain, and operate on Farm Island, S. Dak., certain amusement and recreational facilities; to charge for the use thereof; and for other purposes", is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the said State or city or any agency of the United States operating on said island from removing therefrom, by such means as it may deem appropriate or advisable, such wild bird or other animal, except migratory birds, unless authorized by a permit issued pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, that may become detrimental to the maintenance of said island as a wild game refuge, park, or forest."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Georgia asked to have legislation passed by unanimous consent exempting 500,000 employees of telephone exchanges from the Wage and Hour Act, we were led to believe that we were going to have other amendments to the Wages and Hours Act considered. Had we known that it was only going to be the telephone exchange operators who were to be covered and that the administration was only in favor of that kind of legislation, I question very much if that bill would have gone through for the reason if objection had been registered we might have obtained additional legislation so far as amendments to the Wages and Hours Act are concerned. When the majority leader says we will have no such legislation, the majority party is responsible for that kind of action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of directing the attention of the public and of the Congress to the need for careful study of the grave problem of mass unemployment, I have this day introduced a bill, H. R. 7480, that may well serve as a working basis for our normal legislative processes of committee consideration, public hearings, amendment, and debate. It is in no sense an emergency measure, although the conditions that call it forth cry out for remedy; but if we have learned anything in the past 5 or 6 years, it is that the unemployment problem is not to be tackled as is a four-alarm fire.

Shortly after the Congress recesses I am sailing for Europe, at my own expense, to acquaint myself with what they are doing over there, especially in Sweden and Norway, in their efforts to deal with this most important problem of unemployment, and I hope to bring back with me some information that may be helpful to the Congress when this bill, and

measures with similar objectives, shall be taken up at the next session of Congress.

The bill for an Industrial Reconstruction Act presents a detailed plan to require American industry to function in the public interest on the basis of an economy of abundance, with employment for all able and willing to work. It provides an administrative body, planning agencies, guarantees of the cost of increased production under expansion programs, credit facilities, and a Federal licensing system applicable directly to the major industries in and touching interstate commerce. It creates a Capital Issues Banking System, paralleling in structure the Federal Reserve Bank System, which will underwrite and market all securities affecting interstate commerce and place a prohibitive tax on private investment banking.

The plan is complete, worked out within the framework of democracy and the present American business system. It is not destructive of capitalism, the profit incentive, and/or individual initiative. It is based upon the findings of economists, industrial engineers, and other experts that a coordinated expansion program under governmental direction is practicable, and that through it we can realize full utilization of our productive capacities, natural resources, manpower, and available credit and capital reservoirs.

The plan is a constructive proposal whereby we may effect a permanent recovery from an era of panic, depression, industrial stagnation, and mass unemployment. Mass purchasing power, through employment for all, with higher wage and salary levels for those in the lower brackets, will keep pace with the controlled, ever-ascending spiral of increased production, with a national income of one hundred and thirty to one hundred and thirty-five billions as an attainable goal. The gradual elimination of Government spending for pump-priming purposes will accompany this development, and the augmented Federal revenues due to the increasing national income will make possible lower taxes, a balanced Federal Budget, and the reduction of the public debt.

There should be no hasty criticism of this plan. Prejudice should not speak prematurely. Let the captains of industry and finance and all others who will instinctively oppose it first make certain that they have a more sound and more workable substitute. Let them be definitely concrete in their counter proposals. The people of the United States are long wearied of specious generalizations about "restoring confidence in the business world," "business appeasement," "starting the flow of investment capital," "Budget balancing," "lowering the tax burden," and all such. The people want to be told exactly how these things are to be done and precisely what results may be expected to follow therefrom.

In the closing days of the first session of this Seventy-sixth Congress we have rejected the recovery-lending program and the increased housing program. We have curtailed the work-relief and direct-relief appropriations to such an extent that it is necessary to drop from relief rolls almost a million people at a time when still another million are certified as eligible and are waiting to get on the rolls if they are to be permitted to live. Of what, in God's name, can we be thinking? Does anybody believe that the way to recovery lies on "Unemployment and Starvation Highway No. 1"?

Obviously there can be found a safe and sound way out of the morass in which we have been struggling for now a decade. To deny that is to indict our civilization and the intelligence of our people, and to admit the utter failure of democratic processes and institutions. And the way out must not be a way by which a fortunate few escape from the morass by trampling the less fortunate under foot. It must be a way that is wide enough for a whole people, available to all, and affording equal security to all.

Such a way, I believe, may be constructed through the bill I have introduced.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from California, Mr. THOMAS F. FORD, was unavoidably detained. Had he been present this afternoon, he would have

voted "yea" on the consideration of the rule for the so-called housing bill.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subjects of The Farmer Pays the Bill and The Agricultural Merry-Go-Round.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Would the majority leader, who is now occupying the Speaker's chair, care to say what the program for tomorrow will be?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unless the bill authorizing a housing census is taken up tomorrow, the Chair knows of no business. The Speaker, who will be here tomorrow, may, of course, recognize someone. It is the intention now to bring up a bill authorizing the housing census, and that is all.

Mr. MAPES. That is the bill that provides for incorporating into the regular census a census of housing utilities, electrical equipment, and so forth?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is my understanding.

Mr. MAPES. The Committee on Rules has reported a rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the polar exposition bill at the point in the RECORD where that bill was passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] may be granted the privilege of extending and revising the remarks he made today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE]?

There was no objection.

#### MILK INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, some time ago a resolution was introduced in the House by the gentleman from Virginia asking for an investigation of the milk situation and all relations thereto in the District of Columbia and the milk shed surrounding the District. This resolution was referred to the District of Columbia Committee of the House which handles the affairs of the District. It was my privilege to serve as a member of the Subcommittee on Health, that considered the resolution and we went into it very thoroughly and extensively. As is well known, the committee was blocked in its every effort. Various Members tried to do everything they possibly could to throw obstacles in our way. In spite of that, Mr. Speaker, we continued on. At that particular time some of the gentlemen from Virginia were very anxious and very excited about the fact that we were going to bring milk in from other parts of the United States. The claim was made that the District of Columbia belonged to 800 farmers living in Virginia and 635 farmers living in Maryland, that no other farmer had the right to sell his products in Washington. It was claimed that just those patent-leathered, kid-gloved, limousine-riding farmers who occupy the territory adjacent to the District of Columbia should have this privilege, denying the right to all the other farmers in the State of Maryland and in the State of Vir-

ginia. These people virtually said, "No, my friend, you cannot bring your milk in here or your products. We have the sole right. Why, you might contaminate some of the people in the District. They might be poisoned by your milk."

They made the same statement to the farmers of Pennsylvania. They made the same statement to the farmers of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and all the other States. They said, "Your milk is not any good."

Let us consider as exhibit A, my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin? He was raised on Wisconsin milk.

Let us consider as exhibit B, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and my good friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], my good friend from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], and myself. Contrast those gentlemen with the gentleman from Virginia. [Laughter and applause.] Which goes to prove, Mr. Speaker, that we produce very good milk in other States, as well as Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one point.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the gentleman think that the Congressmen from Virginia and Maryland would really have voted for that trade barrier when it came right down to it?

Mr. SCHULTE. I am not able to speak for them, but I know some of the Representatives from Maryland and Virginia resent that trade barrier just as much as you and I.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHULTE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. A few of those Maryland and Virginia Representatives voted for the million-dollar Eskimo pork project. They did not seem to have any conscience about permitting reindeer milk to come in here and compete in the Washington milkshed.

Mr. SCHULTE. I do not know anything about their thoughts, but I am quite certain, after talking with several of them, that they had intended to vote for the Schulte milk bill which has as its purpose to break down that most vicious barrier that exists around the District of Columbia.

Just recently one of the national magazines, which is sent all over the United States, carried quite a story about the monopoly that has been developed by the patent-leather farmers around the District and some of the distributors in the District of Columbia. We tried to hurry through the Schulte bill so we could have it enacted into law, but because of certain parliamentary tactics that were used it was impossible to do so. I told you at that time that they were going to try to break several independent distributors. We have that spectacle today. Right now the Maryland-Virginia patent-leather-shoe and limousine farmers are selling it to the Richfield Dairy at 17 cents a gallon. They are selling it to Sylvan Seal for 17 cents a gallon. While these distributors can buy at this price, yet their consumers still pay the same high price. Yet the Embassy-Fairfax Dairy must pay 27½ cents a gallon. They are out in the fields right now trying to take away from the Embassy-Fairfax the farmers who are supplying them their milk, with the sole intent of breaking the Embassy-Fairfax Dairy because this dairy has the audacity to try to sell milk at a reasonable price to the consumers in Washington. This entire fight came on because Embassy and Fairfax Dairies were selling milk to the people of Washington at reasonable prices, to wit, 12 cents per quart for grade A milk.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, that is just a part of what is going on. They say, "Oh, we feel sorry for the farmer." This patent-leather farmer that I am talking about, this limousine farmer who drives over his fields in his automobile and does no work, claims that he cannot supply milk unless he gets 28 cents a gallon. He must have at least that. He has proved conclusively that he can manufacture and



produce milk for 17 cents. If not, why is he selling to these particular dairies? The point I am trying to make is that they are getting on an average four and one-quarter cents for the milk sold to Richfield and Sylvan Seal. If the Maryland and Virginia producers, these limousine farmers, can sell milk to Richfield and Sylvan Seal for 4½ cents a quart, then why can they not sell it to the little children on the streets who are white and anemic? This same group, this same outfit, these same vultures, are denying milk to these little tots right today. They say to them, "You are going to pay 14 cents a quart or we are going to let you rot on the streets."

Mr. Speaker, I hope and feel that the Members of this House are very much in sympathy with me in trying to break down this trade barrier that lies around the District of Columbia. I hope that when we come back next year we can prove to the people that we are sincere, that we realize and appreciate the plight in which they find themselves, and that we will say to the people who live in Washington, "We are going to bring down the price of milk," in spite of the ruthless tactics of Mr. Derrick, who heads the Maryland-Virginia Association, and who has been successful in selling himself and his racket to these producers at the expense of a lot of anemic little children and poor families in the District of Columbia. I do hope the people of Washington will help me in this fight by buying milk only from the independent dairies in Washington, who are giving their assistance to the people in this fight for lower-price milk. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the proceedings on the occasion of the dedication of the radio press gallery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio broadcast under the auspices of the American Wildlife Institute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR, Mr. VOORHIS of California, and Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier in the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### PRICES FOR FARM CROPS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of an attempt by the Federal Farm Board to support farm prices by buying surpluses is history. It now appears that history may repeat that tragedy in the loans of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It must be apparent that the farm problem will not be solved until we establish a self-creating and self-financing market for surplus farm products. Such a solution is possible. Perishable surplus crops can be converted into fuel alcohol to supply the demands of a motor age for an improved motor fuel—an alcohol-blend gasoline.

In this way oats and corn that horses no longer eat will be consumed by the engines that have replaced them. In this way acres producing surplus cotton can grow sorghums, and sorghums will make motor fuel.

Such a solution will pay its own way and injure nobody. The increased purchasing power of the farmer will increase the demand for motor fuel and offset any shrinkage in gasoline consumption, and at the same time protect our diminishing oil reserves against the increased rate of consumption.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the outline of a measure to accomplish this purpose, which I propose to introduce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. GREGORY, for Friday and Saturday, on account of important business.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1710. An act to provide for the cancelation of certain notes acquired by the Farm Credit Administration as a result of the activities of the Federal Farm Board; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2654. An act to amend subsection (n), section 77, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, concerning payment of preferred claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 6. An act to return a portion of the Grand Canyon National Monument to the public domain;

S. 474. An act to amend section 92 of the Judicial Code to provide for a term of court at Kalispell, Mont., and, subject to the recommendation of the Attorney General of the United States, to permit the provision of rooms and accommodations for holding court at Livingston and Kalispell, Mont.;

S. 809. An act for the relief of Jessie M. Durst;

S. 839. An act to amend the Retirement Act of April 23, 1904;

S. 891. An act for the relief of J. C. Grice;

S. 1092. An act for the relief of Sigvard C. Foro;

S. 1394. An act for the relief of Johannes or John, Julia, Michael, William, and Anna Kostiuk;

S. 1429. An act for the relief of Earl J. Reed and Giles J. Gentry;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Montie S. Carlisle;

S. 1821. An act for the relief of Harry K. Snyder;

S. 1905. An act for the relief of Elizabeth E. Burke;

S. 2056. An act for the relief of N. F. Clower and Elijah Williams; and

S. 2408. An act for the relief of Russell B. Hendrix.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 543. An act for the relief of Imogene Enley;

H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Bessie Bear Robe;

H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of William H. Keesey;

H. R. 1881. An act for the relief of Anne Boice;

H. R. 2102. An act for the relief of Ada Fuller;

H. R. 2178. An act to amend sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936;

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of Virgil Kuehl, a minor;

H. R. 2514. An act for the relief of G. E. Williams;

H. R. 2610. An act for the relief of G. W. Netterville;

H. R. 2642. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2738. An act providing for the disposition of certain Klamath Indian tribal funds;

H. R. 2750. An act to prohibit the issuance and coinage of certain commemorative coins, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2875. An act to provide that pensions payable to the widows and orphans of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection shall be effective as of date of death of the veteran, if claim is filed within 1 year thereafter;

H. R. 2883. An act to amend the Federal Firearms Act (Public, No. 785, 75th Cong.) so as to more adequately define the term "ammunition" as said term is defined in said act;

H. R. 2971. An act for the relief of certain Indians of the Winnebago Agency;

H. R. 3025. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214-15);

H. R. 3084. An act for the relief of Violet Dewey;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Frank Lopez, administrator of the goods, chattels, and credits which were of Alice C. Lopez, deceased;

H. R. 3215. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 536);

H. R. 3337. An act for the relief of the estate of Arthur Weltner;

H. R. 3345. An act for the relief of Ninety Six Oil Mill, of Ninety Six, S. C.;

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of J. Aristide Lefevre;

H. R. 3795. An act to provide a right-of-way through the Chilkoot Barracks Military Reservation, Alaska;

H. R. 4008. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of Labor;

H. R. 4100. An act to amend the naturalization laws in relation to an alien previously lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence and who is temporarily absent from the United States solely in his or her capacity as a regularly ordained clergyman or representative of a recognized religious denomination or religious organization existing in the United States;

H. R. 4115. An act for the relief of W. C. and James Lattane, and Willie Johnson;

H. R. 4261. An act for the relief of the estate of Frank M. Smith;

H. R. 4264. An act for the relief of Corabell Wuensch, Jackie Lee Wuensch, and Mary Rainbolt;

H. R. 4306. An act to make the United States Coast Guard Academy library a public depository for Government publications;

H. R. 4434. An act to provide for the abatement of personal taxes from insolvent building associations in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4609. An act for the relief of Charles Enslow;

H. R. 4638. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare plans for the eradication and control of the pink bollworm, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4732. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to George M. Corriveau;

H. R. 4733. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Laura T. Corriveau;

H. R. 4742. An act to provide for the establishment of the Chalmette National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4783. An act to provide a right-of-way;

H. R. 4784. An act to provide a right-of-way;

H. R. 4847. An act for the relief of Leland J. Belding;

H. R. 4983. An act to amend sections 712, 802, and 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relative to the requisitioning of vessels;

H. R. 5056. An act for the relief of Nicholas Contopoulos;

H. R. 5450. An act to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjustment Act, as amended, may be filed;

H. R. 5516. An act for the relief of Charlotte E. Hunter;

H. R. 5611. An act to amend section 9 of the act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 817), entitled "An act to readjust the commissioned personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5684. An act amending the act of Congress of June 25, 1938 (C. 710, 52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath Business Committee, and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe;

H. R. 5743. An act for the relief of Walter C. Holmes;

H. R. 5764. An act to provide for the establishment of a cemetery within the Crab Orchard Creek dam project, Williamson County, Ill.;

H. R. 5775. An act for the relief of Michael M. Cohen;

H. R. 5912. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to permit Salt Lake City, Utah, to construct and maintain certain roads, streets, and boulevards across the Fort Douglas Military Reservation;

H. R. 5988. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938 (Public Law No. 583, 75th Cong., 3d sess.);

H. R. 6114. An act to authorize postmasters within the Territory of Alaska to administer oaths and affirmations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6266. An act providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.;

H. R. 6268. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to make certain allowances for losses by leakage and evaporation upon withdrawal of packages of brandy or fruit spirits under certain conditions;

H. R. 6273. An act to exempt certain motorboats from the operation of sections 4 and 6 of the Motor Boat Act of June 9, 1910, and from certain other acts of Congress, and to provide that certain motorboats shall not be required to carry on board copies of the pilot rules;

H. R. 6320. An act to establish the status of funds and employees of the United States Naval Academy laundry;

H. R. 6405. An act authorizing the sale of certain real estate in the District of Columbia no longer required for public purposes;

H. R. 6528. An act to provide for the creation of the George Rogers Clark National Memorial, in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6538. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6539. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6540. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6541. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 6555. An act to amend the act of March 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 374), as amended, relating to the advance of funds in connection with the enforcement of acts relating to narcotic drugs, so as to permit such advances in connection with the enforcement of the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937 and to permit advances of funds in connection with the enforcement of the customs laws;

H. R. 6585. An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 6641. An act for the relief of the Arkansas State Penitentiary;

H. R. 6872. An act to amend sections 4886, 4887, 4920, and 4929 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 31, 32, 69, and 73);

H. R. 6873. An act to amend sections 4904, 4909, 4911, and 4915 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 52, 57, 59a, and 63);

H. R. 6875. An act to amend section 4903 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 51);



H. R. 6899. An act granting pensions to certain veterans of the Civil War;

H. R. 6925. An act to waive the age limit for appointment as second lieutenant, Regular Army, of certain persons now on active duty with the Air Corps;

H. R. 7086. An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7093. An act to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army;

H. R. 7263. An act to permit the importation free of duty of certain literature for distribution at the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939;

H. R. 7288. An act to perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard by authorizing the commissioning, appointment, and enlistment in the Coast Guard of certain officers and employees of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7320. An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1939, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7411. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection thereon of the Columbian Fountain in Washington, D. C.;

H. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing the Librarian of Congress to return to Williamsburg Lodge, No. 6, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, of Virginia, the original manuscript of the record of the proceedings of said lodge;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the delegation of certain authority within the Department of Agriculture;

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of former President Herbert Hoover;

H. J. Res. 264. Joint resolution to approve the action of the Secretary of the Interior deferring the collection of certain irrigation-construction charges against lands under the San Carlos and Flathead Indian irrigation projects;

H. J. Res. 272. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of the city of Gallipolis, Ohio;

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to provide for the adjudication by a commissioner of claims of American nationals against the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution providing that the farmers' market in blocks 354 and 355 in the District of Columbia shall not be used for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 4, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on Labor. S. 1234. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1069), entitled "Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1448). Referred to the committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 793. A bill authorizing payment to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Bands of Sioux Indians for certain lands ceded by them to the United States by a treaty of July 23, 1851; with amendments (Rept. No. 1449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHELCHER: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2665. A bill to provide increases in clerical allowances at certain offices of the third class, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee of conference. S. 2697. An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad (Rept. No. 1451). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WARREN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 291. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 290 (Rept. No. 1542). Ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee of conference. H. R. 875. A bill for the relief of Okie May Fegley (Rept. No. 1453). Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 7480. A bill to encourage and protect commerce among the States and to regulate its flow in order to assure continuous economic prosperity and security, to promote full and effective utilization of available production capacities and make full employment and economic abundance accessible to all, to increase the national income, promote adequate and ever-rising standards of living limited only by our national resources, and to free business from restraints on production, expansion, and trade; (a) by expanding and licensing production of the major industries engaged in interstate commerce, under adequate consumer, labor, business, and public safeguards; (b) by providing the necessary consumer purchasing power for such expanded production through increased employment, assured supplies and flow of credit, better balanced income distributions, increased efficiency, aids in marketing, and reasonable assurances against losses in such expanded production; (c) by making possible under democratic processes such balanced expansion programs and providing the capital funds therefor through the establishment of a National Capital Issues Banking System; and to create the Industrial Reconstruction Commission and other agencies to carry into effect and administer the foregoing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 7481. A bill to amend section 3339 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY:

H. R. 7482. A bill to further amend the act entitled "An act to establish a retirement system for employees of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FADDIS:

H. R. 7483. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish certain markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 7484. A bill to safeguard and protect the lives of fishermen at sea and to inspect fishing vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 7485. A bill to regulate the issuance of commemorative coins; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 7486. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, supp. IV, title 19, sec. 1201, par. 1798); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7487. A bill to provide for the promotion of the welfare of displaced labor in relation to the economic effects flowing from scientific and technological developments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 7488. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 7489. A bill for the relief of Frederick P. Sell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7490. A bill for the relief of Florence Conjard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 7491. A bill for the relief of the alien, James Neohoritis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland:

H. R. 7492. A bill for the relief of J. Frank Kuner, private, uniformed force, United States Secret Service; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7493. A bill for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7494. A bill for the relief of Robert William Holt; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7495. A bill for the relief of Gloria D. Downing; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7496. A bill for the relief of Joseph B. Rupinski and Maria Zofia Rupinski; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 7497. A bill granting an increase of pension to Abigail Daugherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. R. 7498. A bill to provide for the presentation of a medal to Cynthia Chapin in recognition of her valor in saving the lives of 33 of her fellow citizens; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mrs. O'DAY:

H. R. 7499. A bill for the relief of Juda Hersch Katz; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 7500. A bill for the relief of W. P. Richardson; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5209. By Mr. HARTER of New York: Petition of 30 citizens of the Forty-first District of New York, opposing the closing of the nursery-school project in Buffalo; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5210. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Queens County committee of the American Legion, New York, urging the passage by Congress of the bill now pending to establish a 2-cent first-class mail rate throughout the county of Queens; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5211. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of N. V. Noyes, commissioner of agriculture, Albany, N. Y., urging passage of Senate bill 2212; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5212. Also, petition of the Laundry Workers Joint Board of Greater New York, concerning the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

5213. Also, petition of James A. Urich, executive director, American Federation of Housing Authorities, Washington, D. C., urging favorable action on Senate bill 591; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5214. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Earl A. Brown, of Pomona, Calif., and 227 other Work Projects Administration workers of the Twelfth Congressional District to the Congress of the United States, asking for the repeal of the wage-reduction provisions and the 30-day furlough for all workers employed 18 months, and petition against any further reduction in hourly rates; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 4, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 2, 1939)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who are the light of the minds that know Thee, the life of the souls that love Thee, and the strength of the wills that serve Thee: Help us so to know Thee that we may truly love Thee, so to love Thee that we may fully serve Thee, whom to serve is perfect freedom. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Thursday, August 3, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	Lucas	Sheppard
Andrews	Downey	Lundeen	Shipstead
Austin	Ellender	McCarran	Smith
Bailey	George	McKellar	Stewart
Bankhead	Gerry	Maloney	Taft
Barkley	Gibson	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hale	Minton	Tobey
Brown	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Bulow	Hatch	Neely	Truman
Burke	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Byrd	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Holt	Pepper	Van Nuys
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	Wagner
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	King	Reed	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Russell	White
Connally	Lee	Schwartz	
Danaher	Lodge	Schwellenbach	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BLALOCK], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHUE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 875) for the relief of Okie May Fegley.